88-721

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
OCT 25 1988
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

NO. _____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1988

PATSY CAROLYN POE ..... PETITIONER

V.

DONNIE HAYDON, ROBERT S. SMITHER, JOHN S. SPICER, LOWELL CLARK, JAMES E. STEWART, TONY MILLER AND VENTRA HAMMOND ..... RESPONDENTS

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

WILLIAM C. JACOBS
173 North Limestone Street
Lexington, Kentucky 40507
(606) 254-9086

Attorney for Petitioner

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. In a public employee's §1983 action for acts of employment-related sex discrimination, where only the motive for the specific acts for which Defendants claimed qualified immunity was disputed, is the factual issue of whether that conduct was the result of intentional gender-based discrimination a matter for resolution on Defendants' Rule 56 qualified immunity motion, or is it a matter for trial?

2. Where a Rule 56 qualified immunity motion is made after full discovery had occurred, must the §1983 Plaintiff show that the §1983 defendant is not entitled to the defense, or must the §1983 defendant show that he is?

3. Does the answer of eleven (11) §1983 Defendants, amended after full discovery had occurred to allege that "(s)ome of the Defendants, as executive officials of the State, are immune from personal liability," sufficiently assert immunity from personal liability for all Defendants, and the privilege of qualified immunity against subjecting Defendants to trial?

4. Where individual §1983 Defendants had not challenged the sufficiency of the complaint in the light of qualified immunity, and their purported plea of qualified immunity was not made until after all Defendants had voluntarily submitted to depositions, and the dis-

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW (continued)

covery deadline had passed, was there a waiver of the defense, and its privilege against subjection to trial?

5. Must a §1983 Plaintiff, claiming deprivation of Equal Protection because of public employment sex discrimination, present direct evidence of discriminatory intent to defeat a Rule 56 qualified immunity motion?

6. Where a §1983 plaintiff claimed that some of her superiors "acquiesced in, condoned and ratified" public employment-related sexual harassment by taking adverse employment action against her after she complained of sexual harassment by her immediate supervisor, do the offending superiors escape personal liability, if the Plaintiff cannot show that those superiors actively participated in or authorized the specific incidents of harassment of which she complained?

PARTIES

The caption of the case in this Court contains the names of all parties.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Questions Presented i

Parties iii

Table of Authorities v

Opinions Below 1

Jurisdiction 2

Constitutional Provision Involved 2

Statute Involved 2

Statement of the Case 3

Reasons for Granting the Writ 8

Conclusion 19

Appendices 1a

Appendix A - July 28, 1988 Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals Opinion 1a

Appendix B - January 14, 1987 U. S. District Court Order denying motion for summary judgment 37a

Appendix C - March 12, 1987 U. S. District Court Order denying motion for reconsideration of motions for summary judgment 39a

Appendix D - August 25, 1986 Amended Answer 41a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES: Page

Alexander v. *Alexander*,
706 F.2d 751 (6th Cir., 1983) 12, 13, 14

Anderson v. *Creighton*,
483 U.S. __, 97 L.Ed.2d 523, 107 S.Ct.
3034 (1987) 8, 9, 10, 15

Daniels v. *Williams*,
474 U.S. 327 (1986) 9

Davis v. *Scherer*,
468 U.S. 183 (1984) 11, 12

Dominque v. *Telb*,
831 F.2d 673 (6th Cir., 1987) 12

Gomez v. *Toledo*,
446 U.S. 635 (1980) 13-14

Goodwin v. *Circuit Court of St. Louis*
County, Mo., 729 F.2d 541 (8th Cir. 1984),
cert. denied 469 U.S. 1216 (1985) 10

Gutierrez v. *Mun. Ct. of S.E. Judicial*
District, 838 F.2d 1031 (9th Cir. 1988) 10

Harlow v. *Fitzgerald*,
457 U.S. 800 (1982) 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14

Hobson v. *Wilson*,
737 F.2d 1 (D.C. Cir., 1984)
cert. denied sub nom.
Brennan v. *Hobson*, 470 U.S. 1084
(1985) 12

Kennedy v. *City of Cleveland*,
797 F.2d 297 (6th Cir., 1986) 15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (Continued)

CASES: Page

Martin v. *D. C. Metropolitan Police Dept.*,
812 F.2d 1425 (D.C. Cir., 1987) 16

Mitchell v. *Forsyth*,
472 U.S. 511 (1985) 15

Monroe v. *Pape*,
365 U.S. 167 (1961) 9

Pembaur v. *City of Cincinnati*,
475 U.S. 469 (1986) 18

Personnel Administrator of Mass. v. *Feeney*,
442 U.S. 256 (1979) 9

Scheuer v. *Rhodes*,
416 U.S. 232 (1974) 14

Turner v. *Dammon*,
848 F.2d 440 (4th Cir., 1988) 12

Watson v. *Fort Worth Bank and Trust*,
487 U.S. __, 101 L.Ed.2d 827,
108 S.Ct. __ (1988) 17

U. S. CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION:

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1 2

U. S. STATUTES:

28 U.S.C. §1254(1) 2

28 U.S.C. §1343(3) 6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (Continued)

U. S. STATUES: Page

28 U.S.C. §1343(4) 6
42 U.S.C. §1983 ..... 2, 6
42 U.S.C. §2201 6

NO._____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1988

PATSY CAROLYN POE ..... PETITIONER

V.

DONNIE HAYDON, ROBERT S. SMITHER, JOHN S. SPICER, LOWELL CLARK, JAMES E. STEWART, TONY MILLER AND VENTRA HAMMOND ..... RESPONDENTS

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

Petitioner, Patsy Carolyn Poe, respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the opinion and judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit entered in this proceeding on July 28, 1988.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is reported as *Poe* v. *Haydon,* 853 F.2d 418 (6th Cir., 1988), and is reprinted in the appendix hereto, p.1a, *infra.*

JURISDICTION

The Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit issued its opinion on July 28, 1988. No petition for rehearing was filed. This Petition is filed within 90 days after the entry of the judgment below.

The jurisdiction of this Court to review the opinion and judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1254(1).

U. S. CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION INVOLVED

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT

> Section 1. . . . nor shall any State . . . deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

STATUTE INVOLVED

This cases involves 42 U.S.C. §1983, which provides, in pertinent part:

> Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In July, 1984, Petitioner (Poe), a female merit employee of the Commonwealth of Kentucky was transferred to the Kentucky State Capitol Building on the night shift in her capacity as a janitor. In September, 1984, J. L. Henderson (a defendant in the trial court, but not a party to the appeal) became her night shift supervisor.

During November and early December, 1984, Henderson subjected Poe to a succession of sexual assaults on the job. In order of occurrence, and on different nights, Henderson committed the following acts: he grabbed her around the waist, saying he "wanted this 36-year old grandmother"; he came up behind her and patted her "on the butt"; he came to where she was cleaning, sneaked up behind her, threw his arms around her, and grabbed her by the breast; when she and Henderson were riding the elevator from the third to the first floor of the Capitol, he grabbed her arm, held her against the wall, pressed up against her and tried to kiss her; he followed her down the hall and tried to follow her into the women's restroom, but was prevented from doing so by the Capitol Security Guard. All advances were repulsed by her. All were witnessed by Poe's co-workers, or the Security Guard, except the episode on the elevator and the one when Henderson grabbed her breast.

Respondent, Haydon, was the day shift supervisor, but became Poe's "main boss" in September or October

of 1984. In late November or December, 1984, in the company of a co-worker, Poe went to Haydon, and told him that she was having trouble with a man on the night shift, and requested a transfer to the day shift. Poe declined to identify Henderson for fear of getting fired. Haydon did nothing except tell her that if she was unable to take care of it herself, to get back with him.

Thereafter, on December 4, 1984, Henderson came to the room where Poe was working and suggested that they "have an affair." When she responded in the negative, Henderson engaged in conduct which could best be described as an attempted rape. Poe was so upset by this, that she went home early.

By letter of December 10, 1984, addressed to Respondent, Smither, with copies to Respondents, Haydon, Spicer, Stewart and Hammond, Poe complained of Henderson's sexual harassment of her. She requested that she be left alone to do her job without being harassed, that she not lose her job, or be transferred out of the Capitol. Haydon admitted to Poe that he knew something was going on, because whenever he came to the Capitol at night, Henderson was either where Poe was, or heading to where she was.

Haydon, Spicer and Smither met with Henderson that day, but talked to none of Poe's witnesses. Henderson denied everything, including his witnessed conduct. Although he stated that it was "one person's word against the other's," the next day, Haydon changed the

conditions of Poe's employment by assigning two male janitors to work with her at all times, as a buffer against Henderson.

On December 19, 1984, Hammond, whose responsibility was investigating employment discrimination complaints, despite corroborating witnesses to most of Poe's complaints, parroted Haydon's exact words, i.e., "one person's word against the other's."

On December 20, 1984, because of the humiliating requirement of working with the two male janitors at all times, and because Henderson's denials were given credence by her superiors, Poe took a medical leave of absence.

By letter dated February 20, 1985, Respondent, Stewart, informed Poe that the investigation of her charges against Henderson had been inconclusive and gave her four options: (1) return to her regular shift in the Capitol, (2) accept a transfer to the Capitol Annex Building, (3) request a medical leave without pay, or (4) submit a letter of resignation.

By letter, Poe elected to return to her regular shift at the Capitol, stating that she did not want anyone assigned to her for protection against Henderson. She returned to her regular shift on March 1, 1985. Because no significant steps had been taken to resolve her sexual harassment claim against Henderson, Poe filed a sexual harassment charge against him with the EEOC on March 28, 1985. Claiming that they believed that Henderson was still harassing her as of March 28, 1985,

Smither, Clark and Haydon, transferred Poe from the Capitol Building to the Capitol Annex Building on May 8, 1985.

Because working conditions and the opportunity for extra pay are better in the Capitol than in the Capitol Annex, and because it was true, Poe immediately told Clark that she had had no trouble with Henderson since reporting back to work on March 1, 1985. She explained that she had been to the EEOC in February, but that the charges were dated March 28, 1985, because that was the date she signed them. Nevertheless, Clark refused to transfer Poe back to the Capitol.

On December 3, 1985, Poe filed her fact-specific Complaint, in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky at Frankfort, under 42 U.S.C. §1983, against Respondents in their official and individual capacities, claiming deprivation of rights under the Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses. The basis for federal jurisdiction was 28 U.S.C. §1343(3) and (4) and 28 U.S.C. §2201.

Respondents' Answer did not assert a qualified immunity defense. During the 90-day discovery period, fixed by the court without objection from Respondents, all Respondents voluntarily submitted to oral depositions. On August 25, 1986, and after discovery had been completed, Respondents alleged, by Amended Answer, Appendix, p.41a, infra:

> Some of the Defendants, as executive officials of the State, are immune from personal liability.

Based upon this allegation, and without attempting to set out the state of the law governing the conduct of which Poe complained, and relying solely on the seminal cases creating the defense, concluding with *Harlow v Fitzgerald,* 457 U.S. 800 (1982), Respondents filed a Rule 56 motion based on qualified immunity, combined with a Rule 56 motion on the merits. Poe's challenge to the sufficiency of the Amended Answer did not evoke a motion to further amend.

On January 14, 1987, Respondents' combined Rule 56 motions were denied and trial was set for April 20, 1987. Appendix, p.37a, infra. Respondents' motion to reconsider their Rule 56 motions was denied by order of March 12, 1987. Appendix, p. 39a, infra. The trial date was continued pending resolution of Respondents' interlocutory appeal.

On appeal, the court below vacated the trial court's order because reasons for the order had not been articulated. The legal question presented by the interlocutory appeal was not decided, but was remanded, with directions. On remand, Poe's individual capacity claims against Respondents were to be dismissed, unless she could establish *by direct evidence* before trial, during reopened discovery, that Respondents were discriminatorily motivated.

Poe's contentions concerning waiver of the privileges of qualified immunity, the insufficiency of Respondents pleadings, and the failure of Respondents to bear the burden of showing entitlement to the

defense, were rejected by the court below. The court below further ruled that Poe could not prevail against Respondents, individually, unless she pled and proved before trial that they actively participated in or authorized Henderson's harassment of her.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

Summary of Reasons

This case presents important questions bearing on the qualified immunity defense in §1983 actions: because intentional discriminatory motive is an essential element of a §1983 claim based on the denial of Equal Protection because of sex, should that subjective "state of mind" issue be addressed on the Rule 56 qualified immunity motion, or does it present a genuine issue of material fact on the Rule 56 motion going to the merits,[1] requiring a trial; may the defense of qualified immunity be waived, in whole or in part, by the inattention of the §1983 defendant in pleading or otherwise preserving it; which Party must shoulder the burden of prevailing when qualified immunity is raised; what is the quality of the evidence required, if it is the §1983 plaintiff who must present factual evidence of discriminatory motive to defeat a Rule 56 qualified immunity motion; and, must there be actual participa-

---

[1]See the substantial distinction between this case and *Anderson* v. *Creighton*, 483 U.S. __ (1987) set out below at page 10.

tion or authorization by the superiors of a supervisor's sexual harassment of a subordinate, before the superiors are answerable, individually, in §1983 damages. These important questions should be addressed by this court.

1. In a public employee's §1983 action for acts of employment-related sex discrimination, where only the motive for the specific acts for which Defendants claimed qualified immunity was disputed, is the factual issue of whether that conduct was the result of intentional gender-based discrimination a matter for resolution on Defendants' 56 qualified immunity motion, or is it a matter for trial?

From *Monroe* v. *Pape,* 365 U.S. 167 (1961), through *Daniels* v. *Williams,* 474 U.S. 327 (1986), which removed simple negligence from the realm of §1983 actions, to *Anderson* v. *Creighton,* 483 U.S. __, 97 L.Ed. 2d 523, 107 S.Ct. 3034 (1987), with its "objective legal reasonableness" standard in 4th Amendment cases, the law has been settled that the subjective intent of the §1983 defendant when depriving a person of a federal right is not an element of a §1983 claim. The sole exception to this settled rule is the §1983 claim based on a deprivation of Equal Protection. In such a case, the §1983 plaintiff must prove discriminatory intent to establish the §1983 claim. *Personnel Administrator of Mass.* v. *Feeney,* 442 U.S. 256 (1979).

The *Harlow* rule removes the subjective state of mind of the §1983 defendant from the question of the

defendant's entitlement to qualified immunity. However, because the subjective state of mind of the §1983 defendant is an essential element of sex discrimination claims based on the Equal Protection Clause, it does not implicate the artful, state-of-mind allegation requiring a trial, which *Harlow*'s objective test was designed to defeat.

This case is distinguishable from *Anderson* v. *Creighton*. There, the question of a searching officer's qualified immunity turned on whether, in light of the information possessed by him, it could have been *objectively* concluded that the search was legally reasonable. Here, the question of whether Respondents were motivated by gender-based animus turns on the *subjective* state of mind of Respondents. This latter question presents a factual matter, essential to Poe's claims on the merits and is unsusceptible to resolution on a Rule 56 motion.

In conflict with the 6th Circuit, the 9th Circuit in *Gutierrez* v. *Mun.Ct. of S.E. Judicial Dist.*, 838 F.2d 1031, 1051 (9th Cir., 1988), joined the 8th Circuit in *Goodwin* v. *Circuit Court of St Louis County, Mo.*, 729 F.2d 541 (8th Cir., 1984), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 1216 (1985) in holding that qualified immunity is not a defense in cases involving intentional discrimination. *Gutierrez*, at 1053, concluded:

> Discriminatory intent is an essential element of a 1983 action where the underlying claim is a violation of the equal protection clause. Qualified immunity is not a defense in such cases.

This court ought to grant this Petition to decide whether discriminatory motive in a §1983 action founded on the Equal Protection Clause is an element which the Plaintiff must establish to overcome a Rule 56 qualified immunity motion after discovery, or whether discriminatory motive or intent is an element of a Rule 56 motion on the merits and when in dispute, as here, can be resolved only by a trial on the merits.

2. Where a Rule 56 qualified immunity motion is made after full discovery had occurred, must the §1983 plaintiff show that the §1983 defendant is not entitled to the defense, or must the §1983 defendant show that he is?

The court below, by vacating the order denying the qualified immunity defense, raised an important question which this court ought to resolve, i.e., if that affirmative defense is raised, must the plaintiff defeat it, or must the defendant establish it?

Harlow placed the burden on the §1983 defendant to establish entitlement to the qualified immunity defense, holding at 819, that "if the official pleading the defense . . . can prove that he neither knew nor should have known of the relevant legal standard, the defense should be sustained."

Davis v. *Scherer,* 468 U.S. 183 (1984), placed the burden on the §1983 plaintiff to establish the absence of the defense, holding at 197, that "(a) plaintiff . . . may overcome the defendant official's qualified immunity only by showing that those rights were clearly established at the time of the conduct at issue."

The 6th Circuit, in *Alexander* v. *Alexander,* 706 F.2d 751 (6th Cir., 1983), followed *Harlow* and placed the burden on the §1983 defendant. Creating a conflict within the circuit, the court below followed *Scherer,* placing the burden on the §1983 plaintiff. In *Dominque* v. *Telb,* 831 F.2d 673 (6th Cir., 1987), the 6th Circuit held that the burden should not be placed entirely on the defendant at the stage when the sufficiency of the complaint was tested in light of qualified immunity, and required the plaintiff to plead facts which, if true, describe the violation of a clearly established right. (Respondents neglected to raise the defense at that stage.)

The 8th Circuit in *Hobson* v. *Wilson,* 737 F.2d 1, 25 (D.C. Cir., 1984) cert. denied sub nom. *Brennan* v. *Hobson,* 470 U.S. 1084 (1985), followed *Harlow* requiring the defendant to show that he neither knew nor should have known of the relevant legal standard. The 4th Circuit in *Turner* v. *Dammon,* 848 F.2d 440, 445 (4th Cir., 1988) placed the burden on the defendants, affirming a denial of the defense because the defendants offered "no basis from which any reviewing authority can gauge the reasonableness of their actions."

This Court ought to grant this Petition to give guidance to trial courts when deciding the availability of the affirmative defense of qualified immunity and resolve the conflict within the 6th Circuit and the conflict between the opinion below and the 8th and 4th Circuits.

3. Does the answer of eleven (11) §1983 Defendants, amended after full discovery had occurred to allege that "(s)ome of the Defendants, as executive officials of the State, are immune from personal liability," sufficiently assert immunity from personal liability for all Defendants, and the privilege of qualified immunity against subjecting Defendants to trial?

Pleading that "some of the Defendants" are immune from personal liability carries with it the admission that "some" are not. At footnote 3, Appendix, p. 12a, infra, the court below rejected Poe's argument that by pleading that "some" of the Defendants "are immune from personal liability," Respondents failed to plead qualified immunity with respect to any particular Defendant, and therefore had the effect of pleading the defense as to *none* of them. The various acts of which Poe complained differ, depending upon which Respondent's conduct is being challenged, although some of Respondents' acts were jointly committed. Although Respondents argued at the trial court that the acts of individual Respondents were not discriminatory, the defense of qualified immunity was sought by all Respondents (except Henderson), as a group, without particularizing the specific act(s) of each.

Alexander, supra, held that a §1983 defendant has the burden of pleading (and proving) the qualified immunity affirmative defense. The opinion below conflicts with *Alexander,* as well as *Gomez* v. *Toledo,* 446 U.S.

635 (1980), a pre-*Harlow* decision, a holding which *Alexander* followed, and a holding which was unaffected by *Harlow*. Under Rule 8(c) any "matter constituting an avoidance or affirmative defense" shall be set forth affirmatively.

It is not hypertechnical to point out that Respondents pled but one of the three (3) elements of qualified immunity, i.e., immunity from personal liability. Freedom from the burdens of discovery (to which they had freely submitted), and freedom from subjection to trial, were not pleaded.

Poe's contention that Respondents' pleading as to "some" of them does not "exalt form over substance," in light of *Harlow*'s recognition, at 807, that *Scheuer* v. *Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232 (1974) "acknowledged that high officials require greater protection than those with less complex discretionary responsibilities."

The Petition ought to be granted to resolve the question of what a §1983 defendant must plead in order to adequately assert the affirmative defense of qualified immunity so as to achieve the full benefits of that defense, including freedom from subjection to trial.

4. Where individual §1983 Defendants had not challenged the sufficiency of the complaint in the light of qualified immunity, and their purported plea of qualified immunity was not made until after all Defendants had voluntarily submitted to depositions, and the discovery deadline had passed, was their a waiver of the defense, and its privilege against subjection to trial?

Mitchell v. *Forsyth,* 472 U.S. 511 (1985) holds, at 526, that "(t)he entitlement (of qualified immunity) is an *immunity from suit* rather than a mere defense to liability" (Parenthetical supplied; emphasis, the Court's).

Citing *Mitchell,* at footnote 3, Appendix, p.12a, infra, the court below rejected Poe's contention that Respondents waived qualified immunity by failing to seek a resolution of that issue before discovery. Therefore, the opinion below conflicts with *Kennedy* v. *City of Cleveland,* 797 F.2d 297 (6th Cir., 1986), holding, at 300, that the rights of qualified immunity, i.e., freedom from the burdens of discovery, subjection to trial or ultimate liability, can be lost by failure to timely assert the defense. Because no discovery had occurred in *Anderson* v. *Creighton,* the case was remanded for limited discovery on the facts confronting the officer when the search was undertaken. Here, all discovery was completed with no eye toward qualified immunity because Respondents did not purport to plead it until after the deadline for discovery had passed. *Mitchell*

can be easily read to support the conclusion that waiver of the privileges of qualified immunity is a waiver of the defense.

This Petition should be granted to decide to what extent, if any, the qualified immunity defense may be waived by unexcusable delay in raising it, including whether such waiver, if any, applies to Respondents' ultimate personal liability, freedom from subjection to trial, or both.

5. Must a §1983 Plaintiff, claiming deprivation of Equal Protection because of public employment sex discrimination, present direct evidence of discriminatory intent to defeat a Rule 56 qualified immunity motion?

The court below relied on *Martin* v. *D.C. Metropolitan Police Dept.*, 812 F.2d 1425, 1435 (D.C. Cir., 1987), to hold at Appendix, p.34a, infra, that inferential or circumstantial evidence would be insufficient, and that direct evidence of gender-based animus must be provided by Poe to survive Respondents' Rule 56 qualified immunity motion. Although, such reliance was misplaced because *Martin* concerned the subjective state of mind question, as an element of conspiracy, rather than as an element of a claimed deprivation of Equal Protection, the 6th Circuit stands alone in requiring direct evidence to establish discriminatory motive on equal protection claims.

Title VII claims do not differ from §1983 claims relying on the Equal Protection Clause because both

require evidence of discriminatory motive. This Court in *Watson* v. *Fort Worth Bank and Trust,* 487 U.S. __, 101 L.Ed.2d 827, 108 S.Ct. __ (1988) extended for use in cases where subjective employment practices allegedly had a disparate impact, the previously approved use of statistical (circumstantial) evidence in cases where allegedly objective employment practices had a disparate impact, which, in operation were "functionally equivalent to intentional discrimination."

Recognizing that subjective discriminatory motive is rarely provable by direct evidence, courts have long permitted circumstantial or inferential evidence to establish it. This Court ought to grant this Petition to remove the 6th Circuit from its now isolated position, and re-authorize §1983 plaintiffs in that circuit to establish subjective discriminatory motive by less than direct evidence.

6. Where a §1983 plaintiff claimed that some of her superiors "acquiesced in, condoned and ratified" public employment-related sexual harassment by taking adverse employment action against her after she complained of sexual harassment by her immediate supervisor, do the offending superiors escape personal liability, if the Plaintiff cannot show that those superiors actively participated in or authorized the specific incidents of harassment of which she complained?

Poe's claim against Respondents is premised upon their unconstitutional policy of tolerating sexual

harassment of female employees. See, *Pembaur* v. *City of Cincinnati,* 475 U.S. 469 (1986) holding that §1983 plaintiffs need not show that the policy complained of predated the conduct complained of. This policy was advanced by Respondents when they engaged in a "whitewash" and took adverse employment action against her when she complained about the harassment.

Relying on two 6th Circuit cases (Appendix, p.26a, infra) neither of which implicated sex discrimination, the court below established for the 6th Circuit a rule that only supervisors who encourage or directly participate in sexual harassment may be answerable for equal protection deprivations in this context under §1983.

This Court ought to grant this Petition to decide that supervisors who pursue a policy of tolerating sexual harassment in public employment by a "whitewash" of the offending employee's conduct, and by taking punitive employment action against the victim of harassment who complained about it, are answerable personally in damages in a §1983 action, premised on the deprivation of equal protection of the laws.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons a Writ of Certiorari should issue to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit to review its judgment vacating, and remanding with directions, the trial court's order denying the defense of qualified immunity to the Respondents.

WILLIAM C. JACOBS
173 North Limestone Street
Lexington, Kentucky 40507
(606) 254-9086

Attorney for Petitioner

APPENDIX

RECOMMENDED FOR FULL TEXT PUBLICATION
See, Sixth Circuit Rule 24

No. 87-5377

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

PATSY CAROLYN POE, *Plaintiff-Appellee,*

v.

DONNIE HAYDON, et al., *Defendants-Appellants.*

ON APPEAL from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Kentucky

Decided and Filed July 28, 1988

Before: LIVELY, JONES, and BOGGS, Circuit Judges.

BOGGS, Circuit Judge, delivered the opinion of the court in which LIVELY, Circuit Judge, joined. JONES, Circuit Judge, (p. 29) delivered a separate opinion concurring in the result only.

BOGGS, Circuit Judge. In this civil rights suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, various Kentucky state officials appeal the district court's order denying their motion for summary judgment based on qualified immunity. Because the district court did not properly address the issue of qualified immunity, we vacate the denial of

summary judgment and remand for further proceedings.

I

We begin with a brief overview of the facts. Patsy C. Poe was employed as a janitor by the Finance and Administration Cabinet of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. In July 1984, she began working on the night shift at the Capitol Building under the supervision of J.L. Henderson, the night foreman.[1]

In December 1984, Poe asked her superior, appellant Donnie Haydon, Building Superintendent of the Capitol, for a day shift position in the Capitol. Haydon denied the request because there were no openings on the day shift, and the Governor required the bulk of the cleaning to take place on the night shift. Haydon asked Poe whether anyone was giving her a problem of any kind, and she responded that someone was bothering her on the night shift. Poe refused to give his name, however, and indicated she would work out the problem herself. Haydon offered his assistance in the event she could not handle the problem.

On December 10, 1984, Poe wrote a letter to Haydon's supervisor, appellant Robert Smither, Branch Manager of the Division of Physical Plant, accusing Henderson of physical and sexual harassment. Copies of the letter were sent to many of

---

[1]Henderson is not a party to this appeal.

the appellants, including Smither's superior, appellant John Spicer, Director of Physical Plant. In her letter, Poe detailed incidents of harassment and requested the situation be changed. She indicated that she did not want to be transferred out of the Capitol, but simply wanted "to be left alone so I can do my job without being harassed by anyone."

Before Poe's next work shift, Spicer conducted a meeting with Henderson, Haydon and Smither to determine the facts. Henderson denied the allegations, but he was warned that sexual harassment would not be tolerated. After learning of Poe's request for a day shift position, Spicer instructed Smither to offer her the day shift in the New Capitol Annex Building (Capitol Annex), where there was an opening. Alternatively, Poe should be assigned two janitors to accompany her while she worked to prevent her from being alone at any given time.

That same day, Smither and Haydon met with Poe and her husband. Poe again asked to be moved to the day shift in the Capitol, but she was again advised there were no openings. After the meeting, she remained in her present position and was assigned to work with two other janitors to protect her from future harassment. Poe admitted that these two janitors were her friends and she felt safe with them. Nevertheless, she indicated the new arrangement was unworkable. As Poe explained in her deposition testimony, "[W]hen we go in to clean an office, we all had to go together

and three people in one small office, there is no way it can be done . . . [b]ecause you are running over top of each other. If one had to go out to get supplies, we had to quit working and come out and stand in the hallway until the other one come back."

Appellant Ventra Hammond, Director of the Office of Equal Employment Opportunity, initiated her own investigation at the request of Gordon Duke, Secretary of the Finance and Administration Cabinet. Hammond met with Poe and Henderon separately. Based on these interviews, and Spicer's letter which described Poe's meeting with Smither and Haydon, Hammond prepared a December 20, 1984, memorandum to Duke detailing her findings. She concluded that it was "one person's word against the other's," but a further meeting should be held to discuss Poe's allegation of "possible management favoritism."

In addition to her interviews, Hammond asked Spicer to investigate Poe's allegations further. He, in turn, asked Haydon to obtain statements from Poe's witnesses, including fellow janitors Douglas Eversole and Elizabeth Perkins, and security guard Bessie Tracy. These witnesses confirmed Poe's allegations in various respects. Hammond received these statements after preparing her December 20 memorandum, but she did not believe they warranted revising the document.

According to Poe, Henderson did not cause any problems following the December 10 meeting. How-

ever, Poe informed Haydon by letter dated December 20 that she would be taking a leave of absence, "[d]ue to the sexual harassment, nervous condition and pressure of the matter concerning J.L. Henderson."

Appellant James Stewart, Director, Office of Management Services, first became aware of Poe's allegations when Spicer contacted him about Poe's leave of absence. He reviewed Hammond's files and informed Poe by letter dated February 20, 1985, that insufficient grounds existed for any disciplinary action against Henderson. After reiterating that a day shift position in the Capitol was unavailable, Stewart offered Poe several options: 1) return to work on the night shift in the Capitol; 2) accept a transfer to the Capitol Annex, which Stewart understood Poe had been offered earlier; 3) request leave without pay for medical reasons, if her health precluded her from working further; or 4) resign her position by submitting a letter of resignation.

By letter dated February 25, Poe denied that she was ever offered a job in the Capitol Annex, and believed that such a change would result in a cut in pay. Poe asked to return to her previous position on the night shift in the Capitol, but she wanted to be treated "as an equal employee" without anyone assigned to her as protection.

Stewart met with Poe, her attorney and several other employees on March 1, 1985. Poe again requested the day shift position in the Capitol. Since the day shift was unavailable, a position in the Capitol Annex was

offered to her. Refusing this offer, Poe decided instead to return to the night shift in the Capitol, which she did that same day.

On March 28, 1985, Poe filed a sex discrimination charge with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) against the Finance and Administration Cabinet, in which she stated: "No reason has been given as to why I am constantly being harassed by Mr. Henderson. Also, no action has been taken against him." After learning of this statement, Smither, on the recommendation of Haydon, informed Poe by letter dated May 8, 1985, that she would be reassigned to the Capitol Annex on the night shift. She was later permitted to transfer to the day shift in that building.

On May 13, 1985, appellant Tony Miller, Commissioner of the Department of Facilities and Management, became involved when Poe and her husband came to his office complaining about Henderson's past harassment. Poe argued that it was unfair to move her to the Capitol Annex because of the EEOC charge. She brought with her EEOC affidavits containing witnesses' sworn statements regarding Henderson's alleged harassment. Although Miller thought the problem had been resolved earlier, he decided to contact appellant Lowell Clark, Stewart's successor as Director, Office of Management Services. At Miller's request, Clark interviewed three of Poe's witnesses (Perkins, Miller and Eversole) to verify their affidavits.

On May 17, 1985, Clark informed Miller of his conclusions. Clark concluded that there was still no

proof of Poe's allegations. He also saw no reason to question Hammond's earlier investigation. When Clark learned that Poe had written a letter to the Attorney General about Henderson on May 10, 1985, which he interpreted as "stating that a problem is continuing to exist," he consulted with counsel for the Finance and Administration Cabinet. Counsel advised Clark that it was best to keep Poe and Henderson separated while the EEOC charge was being investigated. Clark thus determined that no change in Poe's asssignment (sic) should be made. Upon receiving Clark's letter, Miller's office wrote to Poe on May 17 informing her that "it would be best if you remained in your present work assignment until the federal EEOC complaint is resolved."

On May 31, 1985, Poe filed a charge of retaliation with the EEOC, alleging her transfer to the Capitol Annex was in retaliation for her previous sex discrimination charge against the Finance and Administration Cabinet. She later abandoned her Title VII charges to pursue claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On December 3, 1985, Poe filed the instant action against Henderson and the appellants, alleging violations of the equal protection clause and the due process clause of the fourteenth amendment. In her complaint, she argued principally that the appellants were aware of the hostile and abusive work environment caused by Henderson's sexual harassment, but failed to take immediate action to correct the situation, including an adequate investigation of the matter. The appellants

thus "acquiesced in, condoned and ratified the conduct of Henderson in creating Poe's employment-related, sexually harrassing [sic] environment." She also alleged that appellants reassigned her to the Capitol Annex in retaliation for her filing a charge of sex discrimination with the EEOC. Poe sought compensatory and punitive damages against each appellant, and injunctive relief, which included restoration of sick leave and vacation time, and reinstatement to her previous position in the Capitol.

The parties initiated discovery and Poe deposed the appellants. The appellants then moved for summary judgment on the merits and on the basis of qualified immunity. The district court denied the motion in a brief order. On March 12, 1987, the court denied the appellants' motion to reconsider, ruling that the appellants "may have violated the plaintiff's clearly established rights and hence are not qualifiedly immune." This interlocutory appeal followed.

II

Government officials performing discretionary functions are afforded qualified immunity, shielding them from civil damages, as long as their conduct "does not violate clearly established statutory or constitutional rights of which a reasonable person would have known." *Harlow* v. *Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 800, 818 (1982). Thus, whether an official "may be held personally liable for an allegedly unlawful official action generally turns

on the 'objective legal reasonableness' of the action, assessed in light of the legal rules that were 'clearly established' at the time it was taken." *Anderson* v. *Creighton,* __ U.S. __, __, 107 S.Ct. 3034, 3038 (1987) (citations omitted).

Qualified immunity accommodates two important competing interests. On the one hand, an action for damages may be "the only realistic avenue for vindication of constitutional guarantees" where officials violate the public trust. *Harlow,* 457 U.S. at 814. Yet, the "threat of liability can create perverse incentives that operate to *inhibit* officials in the proper performance of their duties." *Forrester* v. *White,* __ U.S. __, __, 108 S.Ct. 538, 542 (1988) (emphasis in original).

> When officials are threatened with personal liability for acts taken pursuant to their official duties, they may well be induced to act with an excess of caution or otherwise to skew their decisions in ways that result in less than full fidelity to the objective and independent criteria that ought to guide their conduct. In this way, exposing government officials to the same legal hazards faced by other citizens may detract from the rule of law instead of contributing to it.

Id. at __, 108 S.Ct. at 542. *See also Anderson,* __ U.S. at __, 107 S.Ct. at 3038 ("[P]ermitting damage suits against government officials can entail substantial social costs, including the risk that fear of personal monetary liability and harassing litigation will unduly inhibit officials in the discharge of their duties.");

Harlow, 457 U.S. at 814 ("These social costs include the expenses of litigation, the diversion of official energy from pressing public issues, and the deterrence of able citizens from acceptance of public office."). Thus, government officials must be given some assurance that they can perform their duties without fear of monetary liability or the diversions inherent in litigation. The doctrine of qualified immunity seeks to achieve this salutary goal. The doctrine reflects the belief "that officials can act without fear of harassing litigation only if they reasonably can anticipate when their conduct may give rise to liability for damages and only if unjustified lawsuits are quickly terminated." *Davis* v. *Scherer,* 468 U.S. 183, 195 (1984).

In *Anderson* v. *Creighton,* U.S. __, 107 S.Ct. 3034 (1987), the Supreme Court elaborated on the level of generality at which legal rights are "clearly established." The Court pointed out that it would be improper to look at the legal right in the abstract in determining whether the law was clearly established at the time of the defendant's alleged violation.

> [O]ur cases establish that the right the official is alleged to have violated must have been "clearly established" in a more particularized, and hence more relevant, sense: The contours of the right must be sufficiently clear that a reasonable official would understand that what he is doing violates that right. This is not to say that an official action is protected unless the very action in question has previously been held unlawful, but it is to say that

> in the light of preexisting law the unlawfulness must be apparent.

Id. at __, 107 S.Ct. at 3039 (citations omitted). The relevant inquiry focuses on whether a reasonable official in the defendant's position could have believed his conduct to be lawful, considering the state of the law as it existed when the defendant took his challenged actions. *See id.* at __, 107 S.Ct. at 3039-40.

In determining whether the law was clearly established, we look to "federal constitutional, statutory or case law existing at the time." *Dominique* v. *Telb,* 831 F.2d 673, 677 (6th Cir. 1987). When the focus is on decisional law, we examine initially, and most importantly, the decisions of the Supreme Court and the courts of this circuit. *Garvie* v. *Jackson,* 845 F.2d 647, 649 (6th Cir. 1988); *Davis* v. *Holly,* 835 F.2d 1175, 1180 (6th Cir. 1987).[2] If case law from these sources is unavailable, we may also look for guidance to the cases from other circuits.

Resolution of qualified immunity is purely a question of law for the district court. *Dominique,* 831 F.2d at 677. Although "both parties have a great interest in ascertaining and in presenting their views concerning what the clearly established law was at [the relevant] time," the trial judge "bears the ultimate responsibility to resolve the question." *Ibid.*

---

[2]We may also look to the decisions of the highest state court in the state where the case arose. *Robinson* v. *Bibb,* 840 F.2d 349, 352 (6th Cir. 1988).

III

At the outset, we set forth the parties' respective procedural and evidentiary burdens on the qualified immunity issue. Poe contends that the burden is on the defendants to establish that they are entitled to qualified immunity; the plaintiff has no burden whatsoever of showing that the rights at issue were "clearly established" at the time of the alleged violation.[3] By contrast, appellants argue that Poe has the burden of proving that their conduct violated clearly established statutory or constitutional law of which a reasonable official would have known.

In *Mitchell* v. *Forsyth,* 472 U.S. 511 (1985), the Supreme Court made clear that qualified immunity is not simply a defense to liability on the merits, but is in fact "an entitlement not to stand trial or face the

---

[3]Additionally, Poe argues that appellants have waived qualified immunity by failing to identify by name in their amended answer which defendants were asserting the defense. We disagree. The amended answer stated that "[s]ome of the Defendants, as executive officials of the State, are immune from personal liability." The amended answer provided Poe and the district court with sufficient notice of the appellants' claim to qualified immunity. She has not cited case authority, nor offered any compelling reason, why we should conclude that "[t]he failure to plead the defense with respect to any particular Defendant has the effect of pleading the defense with respect to *none* of the Defendants, thereby waiving it as to all." This would exalt form over substance.

We also reject Poe's contention that appellants have waived qualified immunity by failing to seek court resolution of that issue before discovery. *See Mitchell* v. *Forsyth,* 472 U.S. 511 (1985).

other burdens of litigation, conditioned on the resolution of the essentially legal question whether the conduct of which the plaintiff complains violated clearly established law." *Id.* at 526. "The entitlement is an *immunity from suit* rather than a mere defense to liability." *Ibid.* (emphasis in original). Since qualified immunity "is effectively lost if a case is erroneously permitted to go to trial," the Court pointed out, the doctrine has been forumlated in such a way as to allow insubstantial claims to be dismissed early in the litigation, such as by summary judgment, thereby protecting officials from the costs of trial and the burdens of litigation. *Id.* at 526-27.

Since qualified immunity is an affirmative defense which must be pleaded by the defendant official, *Harlow,* 457 U.S. at 815, a civil rights plaintiff need not anticipate the defense in the complaint. We have held, however, that a plaintiff seeking damages against a government official in his individual capacity for an act committed under color of law should "normally include in his original complaint all of the factual allegations necessary to sustain a conclusion that defendant violated clearly established law." *Dominique* v. *Telb,* 831 F.2d 673, 676 (6th Cir. 1987).

> If he does not, however, and if a qualified immunity challenge is made to the complaint, then . . . the court must accord the plaintiff an opportunity to come forward with such additional facts or allegations that show not only violations of his constitutional rights, but also that these rights were so

> clearly established when the acts were committed that any officer in the defendant's position, measured objectively, would have clearly understood that he was under an affirmative duty to have refrained from such conduct.

Ibid. (citation omitted). The plaintiff's failure to plead such facts or allegations prevents the case from moving forward, even from proceeding to discovery, "since the plaintiff has failed to allege acts that are outside the scope of the defendant's immunity " *Kennedy* v. *City of Cleveland,* 797 F.2d 297, 299 (6th Cir. 1986) (citation and footnote omitted), *cert. denied sub nom. Hanton* v. *Kennedy,* __ U.S. __, 107 S.Ct 1334 (1987). *Accord, Anderson* v. *Creighton,* __ U.S. __, __ n. 6, 107 S.Ct. 3034, 3042 n. 6 (1987).

As noted, a public official may assert qualified immunity as an affirmative defense, but the point may also be put at issue before a formal defense is ever asserted. Thus, "the defendant could properly challenge the sufficiency of the complaint under F.R.C.P. 12(b)(6) on the basis that he was entitled to qualified immunity because the facts pleaded would not show that his conduct violated clearly established law of which a reasonable person should have known at the time." *Dominique,* 831 F.2d at 677 Whether qualified immunity is raised in a motion to dismiss or as an affirmative defense, the official must plead facts which, if true, would establish that he was acting within the scope of his discretionary authority when the challenged conduct occurred. *Davis* v *Holly,* 835 F.2d 1175,

1178 (6th Cir. 1987). *See Harlow,* 457 U.S. at 816 "Immunity generally is available only to officials performing discretionary functions.").

If the defendant's qualified immunity cannot be resolved on the pleadings, "then presumably the district court can so hold, and the matter may then either be appealed or proceed on to the discovery stage, after which it might be possible to resolve the issue by appropriate motion for summary judgment." *Dominique,* 831 F.2d at 677 (citing *Anderson,* __ U.S. at __ n. 6, 107 S.Ct. at 3042-43 n. 6). When the defendant takes and interlocutory appeal, all discovery must cease. *Kennedy,* 797 F.2d at 676. If the case proceeds to discovery, "any such discovery should be tailored specifically to the question of [the defendant's] qualified immunity." *Anderson,* __ U.S. at __ n. 6, 107 S.Ct. at 3042 n. 6. Thereafter, the defendant may "file a motion for summary judgment so that the further harassment of going to trial may be avoided." *Kennedy,* 797 F.2d at 299.

When a party moves for summary judgment, the district court must determine, as before, whether the contours of the right that the government official allegedly violated was "sufficiently clear that a reasonable official would have understood that what he is doing violates that right." *Anderson,* __ U.S. at __, 107 S.Ct. at 3039. Since this inquiry will turn on the circumstances with which the official is confronted, and often on the information that he possesses, the district court must consider all the undisputed evidence

produced as a result of discovery, read in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. *Green* v. *Carlson,* 826 F.2d 647, 650-52 (7th Cir. 1987).

If the undisputed facts show that defendant's conduct as a matter of law, did not violate clearly established legal rights, then the district court must grant the defendant summary judgment on the basis of qualified immunity. *Id.* at 652. Thus, for example, the defendant is entitled to summary judgment if discovery fails to uncover evidence sufficient to create a genuine issue as to the truth of the allegations that the defendant in fact committed acts that violate clearly established law. *Mitchell* v. *Forsyth,* 472 U.S. at 526.

On the other hand, summary judgment would not be appropriate if there is a factual dispute (*i.e.,* a genuine issue of material fact) involving an issue on which the question of immunity turns, such that it cannot be determined before trial whether the defendant did acts that violate clearly established rights. *Green,* 826 F.2d at 652. Summary judgment also should be denied if the undisputed facts show that the defendant's conduct did indeed violate clearly established rights. *Ibid.* In either event, the case will then proceed to trial, unless the defendant takes a successful interlocutory appeal on the issue of qualified immunity. *Kennedy,* 797 F.2d at 299-300.

Regardless of the stage at which the issue of qualified immunity is addressed, the district court should indicate the clearly established right at issue and the

factual basis for its conclusion that a genuine issue exists as to the commission of acts violating that right. *Dominique,* 831 F.2d at 677.

IV

In rejecting the appellants' claim to qualified immunity, the district court concluded that the appellants "may have violated the plaintiff's clearly established rights and hence are not qualifiedly immune." In its brief order, the trial court did not articulate its reasons for reaching this conclusion, although we may discern its analysis from the hearing conducted on this matter. Apparently, the district court concluded that Poe had a clearly established right under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e *et seq.*, and perhaps under the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment, to be free from a hostile work environment created by sexual harassment. The lower court denied summary judgment because there was a disputed issue as to whether appellants, in responding to Poe's reports of sexual harassment and to her filing of the EEOC complaint, were motivated by an intent to discriminate.[4]

The district court's ruling is deficient in two fundamental respects. First, and foremost, the district court failed to address the issue of qualified immunity with

---

[4]We will discuss the relevance of a defendant's intent or motive in the qualified immunity analysis in Section VI, *infra.*

reference to the undisputed facts in the record produced by discovery. Although the court had before it the appellants' deposition testimony, the hearing below reveals that the lower court did not read this evidence before ruling on the motion for summary judgment. By limiting its inquiry to the pleadings, the district court's analysis was not faithful to *Anderson*, __ U.S. at __, 107 S.Ct. at 3039.

Second, the court neglected to state more fully the basis for its conclusions. "The minute order disposing of the issue gives us little help in our review." *Whitt* v. *Smith*, 832 F.2d 451, 454 (7th Cir. 1987). We recognize that Rule 52(a), Fed. R. Civ. P., provides that findings of fact and conclusions of law are unnecessary when the district court grants or denies a motion for summary judgment. Because interlocutory review is available for the denial of such motions based on qualified immunity, however, we believe it is better practice for the district court to set forth with precision the basis for its decision. *Dominique*, 831 F.2d at 677. This will facilitate intelligent appellate review, and we believe it will conserve scarce judicial resources in the long run.

Although this court could conduct its own examination of the record and determine if there is a genuine dispute about any fact material to whether appellants violated any clearly established constitutional or statutory rights, we decline to do so. As we discuss *infra*, Section VI, the qualified immunity analysis in

this case will turn in large measure on the appellants' motivations. This particular issue has not been properly addressed by the district court, nor has it been adequately briefed by the parties in this appeal. We suspect the same was true in the district court. Instead, we remand this case for a determination as to whether, based on all the undisputed evidence before the court, a reasonable official in the position of each appellant could have believed his or her conduct to be lawful, considering the state of the law as it existed when he or she took the challenged actions.[5]

V

In order to assist the lower court on remand, we will examine the state of the law as it existed at the time the appellants allegedly engaged in improper conduct. The starting point for our analysis is Poe's claims against the appellants, which she has summarized as follows:

> Defendants knew from Henderson's prior conduct that Henderson had created a sexually harassing working environment, but took no corrective action; that Poe suffered the final sexual assault by Henderson when such Defendants had that knowledge, but that (without regard to whether or not they had such prior knowledge) Defendants acquiesced in and condoned Henderson's conduct

---

[5]Each government official must be judged on the basis of his or her own conduct, intent and position in the state hierarchy.

> by taking adverse, punitive employment action against her, by changing the conditions of her employment, i.e., causing two male coworkers to accompany her at all times; that when Poe's EEOC complaint was served on Defendants, adverse employment action was, again, taken against her by transferring her to a less desirable work-place (whether this was in retaliation for filing the EEOC complaint, or as condoning Henderson's sexually harassing conduct, the transfer violated clearly established federal statutory and constitutional law).
>
> . . . .
>
> It is upon the sex-based discrimination by Appellants in tolerating Henderson's sexual harassment of Poe, by taking adverse employment action against her rather than Henderson, that her Fourteenth Amendment claims are based.

On the basis of the foregoing summary and Poe's complaint we will endeavor to discern the precise legal rights which she contends were violated.

A

Poe argues that the appellants failed to conduct an adequate investigation of her allegations of sexual harassment. Her argument assumes that, had appellants "adequately" investigated her complaint, her allegations of sexual harassment would have been conclusively proven; appellants would then have been constitutionally required to take disciplinary action against Henderson or to move Poe to the day shift in the

Capitol. At oral argument, Poe retreated from this position, indicating that she was not seeking damages from the appellants for their failure to discipline or fire Henderson. We agree with the appellants that, at the time of the alleged violation, Poe did not have a clearly established constitutional or statutory right to a specific outcome following an investigation of her complaint of sexual harassment. *See Davis* v. *Holly,* 835 F.2d 1175, 1180 (6th Cir. 1987). Poe has failed to bring to our attention any case law to support this contention, and we thus find it to be without merit.

This is not a case where supervisory officials refused to conduct any investigation at all. As soon as Poe alerted her superiors to possible sexual harassment, an investigation was initiated to determine the facts. Indeed, the record shows that no less than three separate investigations of Poe's complaint were initiated during the events in question; those of Spicer, Hammond and Clark. These investigations proved inconclusive, however, and appellants felt unable to discipline Henderson. They were also prevented from moving Poe to a day shift position in the Capitol because there were no openings, a reason totally divorced from the merits of the sexual harassment claim. Whether the results of the investigations were right or wrong is an open question, but "it is clear the [appellants] did not stand idly by once alerted to the possibility of a problem. . . . ." *Ibid.*

B

Next, Poe claims that the appellants were aware of the offensive and hostile work environment created by Henderson's sexual harassment, but failed to take corrective action. While not clearly articulated, we understand her claim to be based on Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e, *et seq.* In essence, Poe contends that at the time of the challenged conduct, Title VII protected an employee from a hostile or abusive work environment resulting from sexual harassment. This argument has considerable force.

Title VII makes it unlawful for an "employer . . . to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's . . sex . . . ." 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a)(1). In *Meritor Savings Bank, FSB* v. *Vinson,* 477 U.S. 57, __, 106 S.Ct. 2399, 2409 (1986), the Supreme Court ruled that "hostile environment" sexual harassment is a form of sex discrimination prohibited by Title VII. However, *Vinson* merely confirmed what had already been well established before December 1984 in many circuits, *Simmons* v. *Lyons,* 746 F.2d 265, 270 (5th Cir. 1984); *Katz* v. *Dole,* 709 F.2d 251, 254 (4th Cir. 1983); *Henson* v. *City of Dundee,* 682 F.2d 897 (11th Cir. 1982); *Bundy* v. *Jackson,* 641 F.2d 934 (D.C. Cir. 1981); *Tomkins* v. *Public Service Electric & Gas Co.,* 568 F.2d 1044, 1048-49 (3d Cir. 1977), as well as in the district courts of the Sixth Circuit. *See, e.g., Rabidue* v. *Osceola Refining*

Co., 584 F.Supp. 419, 427-33 (E.D. Mich. 1984), *aff'd*, 805 F.2d 611 (6th Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, __ U.S. __, 107 S.Ct. 1983 (1987); *Coley* v. *Consolidated Rail Corp.*, 561 F.Supp. 645, 646 (E.D. Mich. 1982) (and cases cited therein). Indeed, the EEOC as early as 1980 issued guidelines specifying that sexual harassment was a form of sex discrimination prohibited by Title VII. 29 C.F.R. § 1604.11(a). *See Vinson*, 477 U.S. at 65, 106 S.Ct. at 2405.

Further, the law was clearly established that an employer may be held liable under Title VII for "hostile environment" sexual harassment, whether the offender was a fellow employee, *Henson*, 682 F.2d at 905 & n. 9; *Bundy*, 641 F.2d at 947; *Rabidue*, 584 F.Supp. at 431 & n. 47; *Coley*, 561 F.Supp. at 650; 29 C.F.R. § 1604.11(d), or a supervisory employee (*i.e.*, the agent of the employer), *Craig* v. *Y&Y Snacks, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 77, 80-81 (3d Cir. 1983); *Bundy*, 641 F.2d at 943, 947; *Miller* v. *Bank of America*, 600 F.2d 211, 213 (9th Cir. 1979); 29 C.F.R. § 1604.11(c).

Despite the force of Poe's legal argument, her contention based on Title VII must fail. In *Davis* v. *Scherer*, 468 U.S. 183 (1984), the Supreme Court ruled that "[n]either federal nor state officials lose their immunity by violating the clear command of a statute or regulation—of federal or of state law—unless that statute or regulation provides the basis for the cause of action sued upon." *Id.* at 194 n. 12. This is the case where the statute itself authorizes a cause of action for damages,

see, e.g., Harlow, 457 U.S. at 820 n. 36, or where the statute provides a basis for an action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, *see, e.g., Maine* v. *Thiboutot,* 448 U.S. 1 (1980).

In the instant case, Poe proceeded solely under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Title VII does not provide "the basis for the cause of action sued upon," *Davis,* 468 U.S. at 194 n. 12, because 1) Poe abandoned her Title VII claims to pursue her claims under § 1983; and 2) Title VII does not provide the basis for an action brought under § 1983. *Day* v. *Wayne County Board of Auditors,* 749 F.2d 1199, 1204 (6th Cir. 1984) Thus, the mere fact that Poe's Title VII rights to be free from "hostile environment" sexual harassment were clearly established at the time of the challenged conduct is not sufficient to defeat appellants' qualified immunity. *See Gagne* v. *City of Galveston,* 805 F.2d 558, 560 (5th Cir. 1986), *cert. denied sub nom. Gagne* v. *Putnal,* __ U.S. __, 107 S.Ct. 3266 (1987). Poe's claims then must rest on alleged violations of the Constitution.

C

Appellants have characterized Poe's chief constitutional claim as follows: 1) whether sexual harassment is a violation of the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment; and, if so, 2) whether supervisory officials can be held liable for sexual harassment committed by subordinates. Appellants argue that, at the time of the challenged conduct, sexual harassment was

not a violation of the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment and, moreover, supervisory officials could not be held liable for harassment committed by subordinates. Although we disagree with this assessment of the law, we conclude that Poe's § 1983 sexual harassment claims here must fail.

The case law before December 1984 established that sexual harassment by government employers would violate the rights protected by the equal protection clause. *Huebschen* v. *Department of Health and Social Services,* 716 F.2d 1167, 1172 (7th Cir. 1983) ("sexual harassment . . . directed solely at the plaintiff because she was a woman" violates the equal protection clause);[6] *Skadegaard* v. *Farrell,* 578 F.Supp. 1209, 1216-17 (D. N.J. 1984); *Woerner* v. *Brzeczek,* 519 F.Supp. 517, 519-20 (N.D. Ill. 1981). *See Scott* v. *City of Overland Park,* 595 F.Supp. 520, 529 (D. Kan. 1984). Two other district courts, including the United States

---

[6]Appellants argue that *Huebschen* never specifically ruled that sexual harassment can be the basis of an action under the equal protection clause. While there is no explicit language to that effect, we believe the focus of the entire case is to the contrary. In *Huebschen* the Seventh Circuit ruled that sexual harassment does not violate the equal protection clause when the offensive conduct is not aimed at the plaintiff because of his or her gender. The court held that the female defendant harassed the male plaintiff not because the plaintiff was a man, but because the plaintiff was a former lover who had jilted the defendant. The plaintiff's gender, it said, was "merely coincidental" to the defendant's action. 716 F.2d at 1172. The court's reasoning indicates that the plaintiff could nevertheless prevail if he were able to prove that the defendant harassed him because he was a man.

District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, came to this conclusion several months before Poe was reassigned to the Capitol Annex on the night shift. *Gobla* v. *Crestwood School District,* 609 F.Supp. 972, 978-79 (M.D. Pa. 1985); *Estate of Scott by Scott* v. *deLeon,* 603 F.Supp. 1328, 1332 (E.D. Mich. 1985).

On the issue of § 1983 liability of supervisory personnel, *Hays* v. *Jefferson County,* 668 F.2d 869 (6th Cir.), *cert. denied,* 459 U.S. 833 (1982), established that a supervisory official's failure to supervise, control, or train the offending individual is not actionable, unless the supervisor "either encouraged the specific incident of misconduct or in some other way directly participated in it." *Id.* at 874. *See also Bellamy* v. *Bradley,* 729 F.2d 416, 421 (6th Cir.) *cert. denied,* 469 U.S. 845 (1984).

Poe's sexual harassment claim fails on this latter score. Even assuming the allegations in her complaint are true, she has not averred that "any of the supervisory officials who [are] defendants in this case actively participated in or authorized any harassment" by Henderson. *Bellamy,* 729 F.2d at 421. At best, she has merely claimed that the appellants were aware of alleged harassment, but did not take appropriate action. This is insufficient to impose liability on supervisory personnel under § 1983. *Ibid.*

D

Finally, Poe contends that the appellants' decisions to change the conditions of her employment — assign-

ing two male coworkers to accompany her while she worked in the Capitol and then transferring her to the Capitol Annex — in response to her sexual harassment complaints constituted gender-based discrimination in violation of the equal protection clause.[7] Poe appears to argue that she was treated differently merely because she was a woman; that had the aggrieved party been a man, and the offending individual a woman, the appellants would have responded quite differently.

There can be little doubt that, before December 1984, a female public employee had a constitutional right to be treated on the same basis as a male employee. *Davis* v. *Passman,* 442 U.S. 228 (1979), made

---

[7]Poe also argues that the appellants transferred her to the Capitol Annex in retaliation for filing her sex discrimination charge with the EEOC. Although we do not believe Poe is basing this claim on section 704(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-3(a), our discussion of *Davis* v. *Scherer, supra* at 18-19, is dispositive in any event.

Instead, we understand her central contention to be that she was constructively demoted without notice or hearing, in violation of the due process clause of the fourteenth amendment. We will not consider this claim, however, because it is inadequately developed. Since the district court will consider the issue of qualified immunity further, Poe may develop her due process claim more fully on remand.

The district court may wish to explore the monetary disparity between Poe's night shift position in the Capitol and her position in the Capitol Annex. The Seventh Circuit has "expressed a reluctance to find a transfer to the same pay level to be a violation [of the due process clause] of the Fourteenth Amendment." *Greenberg* v. *Kmetko,* 840 F.2d 467, 475 (7th Cir. 1988) (en banc).

clear that sex discrimination against a public employee is a violation of the equal protection component of the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment, as long as that discrimination cannot be shown to serve important governmental objectives and is not substantially related to achievement of those objectives. *See Goodwin* v. *Circuit Court of St. Louis County, Missouri,* 729 F.2d 541, 546 (8th Cir. 1984) ("The right to be free of invidious discrimination on the basis of sex certainly is clearly established, and no one who does not know about it can be called 'reasonable' in contemplation of law.") This includes employment decisions relating to hiring and firing, *Davis,* 442 U.S. at 235, promotions, *Scott* v. *Overland Park,* 595 F.Supp. 520 (D. Kan. 1984), and transfers, *Goodwin,* 729 F.2d at 546-47. Appellants do not deny that the same is true under the fourteenth amendment. *Huebschen* v. *Department of Health and Social Services,* 716 F.2d 1167, 1171 n. 1 (7th Cir. 1983).

VI

Having determined that Poe's claims may be based on the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment, our inquiry is not at an end. This is so because an essential element of any equal protection claim is purposeful discrimination. *Personnel Administrator* v. *Feeney,* 442 U.S. 256, 276 (1979). Based on Poe's core claim that the appellants were animated by improper motives, the district court concluded that motive was a disputed issue which precluded summary judgment for the appellants on the basis of qualified immunity.

Although *Harlow* and its progeny eschewed inquiry into a defendant official's subjective intent, *see Davis* v. *Scherer,* 468 U.S. 183, 191 (1984) (*Harlow* "rejected the inquiry into state of mind in favor of a wholly objective standard"); *Mitchell* v. *Forsyth,* 472 U.S. 511, 517 (1985) (*Harlow* "purged qualified immunity doctrine of its subjective components"); *Malley* v. *Briggs,* 475 U.S. 335, 341 (1986) (Under *Harlow,* "an allegation of malice is not sufficient to defeat immunity if the defendant acted in an objectively reasonable manner."), it apparently did not rule out all consideration of the official's discriminatory intent or motive in cases where, as here, the existence of a violation is dependent on proof of such intent. As Judge (now Justice) Scalia wrote in *Halperin* v. *Kissinger,* 807 F.2d 180, 184 (D.C. Cir. 1986), whether conduct does violate clearly established rights will often turn on the intent with which the conduct is performed. He said: "And it is impossible to place '[r]eliance on the objective reasonableness of an official's conduct, as measured by reference to clearly established law,' when clearly established law makes the conduct legal or illegal depending upon the intent with which it is performed." *Ibid.* (citation omitted).

The Ninth Circuit in *Gutierrez* v. *Municipal Court of Southeast Judicial District,* 838 F.2d 1031 (9th Cir. 1988), illustrated this point well:

> For example, if a public employer terminates a black employee because he is black, that act clearly

> violates federal constitutional and statutory law. If, however, the employer terminates the black employee because of incompetence, then the discharge obviously does not violate the law at all. The act itself — the act of discharge — is neutral; it is the motive or intent that makes the act both actionable and violative of clearly established law.

Id. at 1050 (citations omitted). Thus, the objective legal reasonableness of the public employer's conduct will turn, necessarily, on whether that conduct was motivated by racial, sexual or political animus or by a legitimate concern for workplace efficiency.

The question that remains, of course, is the scope of the Supreme Court's admonition against considering the defendant official's subjective intent. As Judge Scalia asked, perhaps rhetorically, is "the expansive language of *Harlow, Forsyth,* and *Davis* . . . to be taken seriously"? *Halperin,* 807 F.2d at 185. It may be significant that, since *Harlow,* the Supreme Court has not considered a case involving qualified immunity where motive or intent is a critical element of the offense. *See Gutierrez,* 838 F.2d at 1050 n. 25.[8] This may suggest that the present case is quite different from the one envisioned by *Harlow.*[9]

---

[8]*Forrester* v. *White,* __ U.S. __, 108 S.Ct. 538 (1988) involved a claim to absolute immunity.

[9]It is interesting to point out that Justice Scalia in *Anderson* v. *Creighton,* __ U.S. __, __, 107 S.Ct. 3034, 3040 (1987), read

(continued on next page)

Although this area of the law is murky, we agree with Judge Scalia that we should view *Harlow* as prohibiting an inquiry into intent as it bears on a "defendant's knowledge of the state of the law;" but not as rejecting inquiry into motive or intent "unrelated to knowledge of the law (*e.g.*, racial or political antagonism)." *Halperin*, 807 F.2d at 186. *Accord*, *Turner* v. *Dammon*, __ F.2d __ (4th Cir. 1988) (Kaufman, J., dissenting). *See* Balcerzak, Qualified Immunity for Government Officials: The Problem of Unconstitutional Purpose in Civil Rights Litigation, 95 Yale L.J. 126, 127 (1985) ("It is unlikely that the Court meant for *Harlow* to prevent a plaintiff from inquiring into the reasons behind an official's conduct when the substantive law controlling the plaintiff's claim makes the official's state of mind a necessary component of the constitutional violation.").

Thus, under *Harlow*, it is still impermissible to inquire whether the defendant official actually knew that his conduct was unlawful. But, we agree with those circuits that have recognized that a government

---

(*footnote 9, continued from previous page*)

Harlow as seeking to "minimize" inquiry into an official's subjective intent, rather than seeking to "purge" or "reject" such an inquiry. As Judge Kaufman has noted recently, there is no indication in *Anderson* that Justice Scalia changed the views he expressed a year earlier in *Halperin*. *Turner* v. *Dammon*, __ F.2d (4th Cir. 1988) (Kaufman, J., dissenting). Of course, it is an open question whether a majority of Justice Scalia's colleagues would agree with him.

official's motive or intent in carrying out challenged conduct must be considered in the qualified immunity analysis, where unlawful motive or intent is a critical element of the substantive claim *Gutierrez* v. *Municipal Court of Southeast Judicial District,* 838 F.2d 1031, 1051 (9th Cir. 1988) ("where the lawfulness of a challenged act is dependent upon the actor's motive or intent, the purpose for which the act was undertaken must be analyzed and not just the act itself."); *Martin* v. *D.C. Metropolitan Police Department,* 812 F.2d 1425, 1433 (D.C. Cir. 1987) ("when the governing precedent identifies the defendant's intent (unrelated to knowledge of the law) as an essential element of plaintiff's constitutional claim, the plaintiff must be afforded an opportunity to overcome an asserted immunity with an offer of proof of the defendant s alleged unconstitutional purpose.") (citation and footnote omitted); *Wright* v. *South Arkansas Regional Health Center, Inc.,* 800 F.2d 199 (8th Cir. 1986). *See Kenyatta* v. *Moore,* 744 F.2d 1179, 1185 (5th Cir. 1984) ("Because the [*Harlow*] Court did not . . . purge substantive constitutional doctrine of all subjective issues, it did not entirely eliminate subjective inquiry from every qualified immunity analysis: some right . . . might be violated by actions undertaken for an impermissible purpose but not by the same actions undertaken for permissible purposes.") (footnote omitted), cert. denied, 471 U.S. 1066 (1985). Thus, "in deciding whether a defendant is entitled to qualified immunity in cases in which unlawful motive is a critical element. the court must consider

the actor's intent in carrying out the act that is alleged to have resulted in the violation of the plaintiff's rights." *Gutierrez,* 838 F.2d at 1051.

Our discussion of the relevance of motive or intent is especially applicable to Poe's claim of sex discrimination in violation of the equal protection clause. Poe's core claim, as we read it, is that the appellants' conduct, particularly their decisions to assign her to work with two fellow janitors and later to transfer her to the Capitol Annex, in response to her sexual harassment complaints was motivated by gender-based animus. Here, as we have shown, there is no doubt that the right to be free from sex discrimination is protected by the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment. But in deciding whether the appellants violated clearly established rights, there must be an inquiry sensitive to their individual motivations. Without an intent to discriminate on the basis of sex, the appellants' decisions reflected at most an attempt at a temporary resolution of an ambiguous situation.

This case has already proceeded to discovery, so we have no occasion to discuss a plaintiff's pleading responsibilities where motive or intent is an essential element of the challenged conduct. *See Gutierrez,* 838 F.2d at 1051-52; *Hobson* v. *Wilson,* 737 F.2d 1, 26-29 (D.C. Cir. 1984), *cert. denied sub nom. Brennan* v. *Hobson,* 470 U.S. 1084 (1985). Where, as here, discovery has taken place and the defendant officials have moved for summary judgment on the basis of qualified

immunity, we believe the plaintiff must present direct evidence that the officials' actions were improperly motivated in order to have any hope of defeating the motion. *Martin,* 812 F.2d at 1435. The plaintiff, "to avert dismissal short of trial, must come forward with something more than inferential or circumstantial support for [her] allegation of unconstitutional motive." *Ibid.*

Because the law concerning the interplay between qualified immunity and impermissible motive was "far from clear," *Gutierrez,* 838 F.2d at 1052; *Martin,* 812 F.2d at 1436, at the time the district court made its ruling in this case, we believe the plaintiff should be given an opportunity to amend her response, if necessary, to appellants' motion for summary judgment to make the showing mandated by the foregoing discussion. Appellants should be given an opportunity to make any adjustments to the summary judgment motion as well.

VII

In conclusion, we set forth the district court's inquiry on remand. The district court's main task is to look to the undisputed facts in the record, viewed in a light most favorable to the non-moving party, in determining if there is a genuine issue as to whether the appellants' conduct violated clearly established constitutional rights.

On Poe's sex discrimination claim, the question is whether a reasonable official in the position of each appellant could have believed that transferring Poe to the Capitol Annex and assigning her to work with two other janitors was lawful, considering that gender-based employment decisions violate the equal protection clause (assuming those decisions do not serve important governmental objectives and are not substantially related to achievement of those objectives). If there is a genuine issue of material fact concerning an appellant's motivation for those decisions, and there is direct evidence that an appellant was motivated by Poe's gender, then summary judgment should be denied. If, on the other hand, Poe is unable to provide any direct evidence of gender-based animus, summary judgment must be granted for the appellants. *See, e.g., Wright* v. *South Arkansas Regional Health Center, Inc.*, 800 F.2d 199, 204-205 (8th Cir. 1986).

We emphasize that the district court should not rule against the appellants merely for reaching the "wrong" decision in their investigation of Poe's complaint, even assuming such a judgment can be reached at this stage of the litigation. Rather, the court should take into account the investigations that were initiated, and the conclusions that were reached, and then consider whether the appellants reasonably could have concluded that their subsequent actions in assigning Poe to a crew of three and transferring her to the Capitol Annex did not violate Poe's legal rights. *See*

Garvie v. *Jackson*, 845 F.2d 647, 652 (6th Cir. 1988). The analysis for Poe's retaliation claim is similar.

Accordingly, the judgment of the district court is vacated and the case remanded for proceedings consistent with this opinion.

JONES, J., concurring. Because I find the majority opinion engages in more analysis than necessary to resolve this matter, I concur in the result only.

* * * * * * *

Eastern District of Kentucky
FILED
JAN 14 1987
AT COVINGTON
LESLIE G. WHITMER
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY
AT FRANKFORT

CIVIL ACTION NO. 85-99

PATSY CAROLYN POE — PLAINTIFF

VS. **ORDER**

J. L. HENDERSON, ET AL — DEFENDANTS

On January 9, 1987, oral argument on defendants' motion for summary judgment was held in this matter, at Lexington. William Jacobs represented the plaintiff, and Edwin S. Hopson and Monte D. Gross represented the defendants. Charles Witcliffe of the Finance Cabinet was present as well. The court having heard counsel and being sufficiently advised,

IT IS ORDERED as follows:

1. That defendants' motion for summary judgment be, and it is, hereby DENIED;

2. That the parties will try to settle this matter and file a status report with the court on or before FEBRUARY 1, 1987;

3. That a final pretrial conference will be held in this matter on THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 1987 at 3:30 P.M. in Frankfort;

4. That trial of this matter shall commence on MONDAY, APRIL 20, 1987 at 9:30 A.M. in Frankfort, before Honorable Richard F. Suhrheinrich, Visiting Judge; and

5. That plaintiff is reminded of F.R.Civ.P. 11 and of 42 U.S.C. §1988 and shall detail the evidence against the various state officials in this final pretrial memorandum.

This 13th day of January, 1987.

/s/ William O. Bertelsman
JUDGE

* * * * * * * *

Eastern District of Kentucky
FILED
MAR 12 1987
AT FRANKFORT
LESLIE G. WHITMER
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY
AT FRANKFORT

CIVIL ACTION NO. 85-99

PATSY CAROLYN POE — PLAINTIFF

VS. **ORDER**

J. L. HENDERSON, ET AL — DEFENDANTS

On March 5, 1987, a final pretrial conference was held in this matter, at Frankfort. William C. Jacobs represented the plaintiff; Edwin S. Hopson and Monte D. Gross represented the defendants. The court having heard counsel and being sufficiently advised,

IT IS ORDERED as follows:

1. That the motion of defendants to reconsider this court's order denying summary judgment be, and it is, hereby DENIED;

2. That the motion of defendants for leave to file substitute page be, and it is, hereby GRANTED;

3. That the motion of plaintiff for leave to file an Amended Complaint be, and it is, hereby DENIED;

4. That the motion of plaintiff to reschedule pretrial conference or for additional time for compliance with the final pretrial conference order be, and it is, hereby DENIED as moot;

5. That, the court having held that the remaining defendants may have violated the plaintiff's clearly established rights and hence are not qualifiedly immune, and the defendants having indicated a desire to take an appeal on this issue, the trial date of Monday, April 20, 1987 at 10:00 A.M. be, and it is, hereby CONTINUED pending resolution of this issue.

This 11th day of March, 1987.

/s/ William O. Bertelsman
WILLIAM O. BERTELSMAN,
JUDGE

* * * * * * * *

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY
FRANKFORT DIVISION

PATSY CAROLYN POE, PLAINTIFF,

v. CIVIL NO. 85-99

J.L. HENDERSON, et al., DEFENDANTS.

AMENDED ANSWER TO THE COMPLAINT

Defendants, J. L. Henderson, Donnie Haydon, Robert S. Smither, John S. Spicer, Lowell Clark, James E. Stewart, Tony Miller, Gordon Duke, Ventra Hammond, Thomas C. Greenwell, and George Russell, by counsel, for their Amended Answer to the Complaint herein, state as follows:

FIRST DEFENSE

Defendants reiterate and incorporate by reference as if fully set out herein all defenses previously asserted in their Answer to the Complaint herein.

SECOND DEFENSE

Some of the Defendants, as executive officials of the State, are immune from personal liability.

WHEREFORE, Defendants, J.L. Henderson, Donnie Haydon, Robert S. Smither, John S. Spicer, Lowell Clark, James E. Stewart, Tony Miller, Gordon Duke, Ventra Hammond, Thomas C. Greenwell, and George Russell, demand that the Complaint herein be dismissed with prejudice and held for naught; that it recover its costs herein expended, including a reasonable

attorney's fee; and all other relief to which it may appear to be entitled.

Of Counsel:

Monte D. Gross
Office of Legal and
Legislative Services
Commonwealth of Kentucky
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

/s/ Edwin S. Hopson
Edwin S. Hopson
Rhonda E. Curry
WYATT, TARRANT & COMBS
Citizens Plaza
Louisville, Kentucky 40202
(502) 589-5235

Counsel for Defendants,
J.L. Henderson, Donnie Haydon, Robert S. Smither, John S. Spicer, Lowell Clark, James E. Stewart, Tony Miller, Gordon Duke, Ventra Hammond, Thomas C. Greenwell, and George Russell

* * * * * * *

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
NOV 23 1988
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

No. 88-721

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1988

PATSY CAROLYN POE

Petitioner,

v.

DONNIE HAYDON, ROBERT S. SMITHER, JOHN S. SPICER, LOWELL CLARK, JAMES E. STEWART, TONY MILLER AND VENTRA HAMMOND

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

RESPONDENTS' BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

OF COUNSEL:
Monte D. Gross
Office of Legal and Legislative Services
Finance and Administration Cabinet
Commonwealth of Kentucky
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

EDWIN S. HOPSON
Counsel of Record for Respondents
RHONDA E. CURRY
WYATT, TARRANT & COMBS
Citizens Plaza
Louisville, Kentucky 40202
(502) 589-5235

COCKLE LAW BRIEF PRINTING CO., (800) 225-6964
OR CALL COLLECT (402) 342-2831

COUNTERSTATEMENT OF QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. Whether a §1983 Plaintiff by merely alleging a constitutional violation implicating unconstitutional motive without producing any evidence of unconstitutional motive may defeat a Defendant's motion for summary judgment based on qualified immunity and subject the Defendant to the burdens of trial.

II. Whether a §1983 Plaintiff has the burden of producing evidence sufficient to create a genuine issue of fact as to whether the Defendant acted unconstitutionally when the Defendant moves for summary judgment based on qualified immunity.

III. Whether §1983 Defendants are required to plead qualified immunity with specificity when their pleading generally has put the Plaintiff on notice of the defense.

IV. Whether §1983 Defendants have the right to amend their answer and raise the qualified immunity defense after discovery has occurred.

V. Whether a §1983 Plaintiff must present direct evidence of unconstitutional motive when unconstitutional motive is an element of the Plaintiff's claim, in order to defeat a motion for summary judgment based on qualified immunity.

VI. Whether supervisory officials who did not actively participate in or authorize constitutional violations are personally liable for alleged constitutional violations by an employee in a §1983 action.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

COUNTERSTATEMENT OF QUESTIONS PRESENTED i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii

COUNTERSTATEMENT OF THE CASE 1

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 9

ARGUMENT: REASONS WHY WRIT SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED 10

CONCLUSION 27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

Alexander v. Alexander, 706 F.2d 751 (6th Cir. 1983) 20

Anderson v. Creighton, ___U.S.___, 107 S.Ct. 3034 (1987) 17, 23

Bellamy v. Bradley, 729 F.2d 416 (6th Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 845 (1984) 25

Dominique v. Telb, 831 F.2d 673 (6th Cir. 1987) 18

Duchesne v. Sugarman, 566 F.2d 817 (2d Cir. 1977) 25

Gomez v. Toledo, 446 U.S. 635 (1980) 20

Goodwin v. Circuit Court of St. Louis County, Missouri, 729 F.2d 541 (8th Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 1216 (1985) 15

Gutierrez v. Municipal Court of S.E. Judicial District, 838 F.2d 1031 (9th Cir. 1988) 14, 15, 19

Hall v. United States, 704 F.2d 246 (6th Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 464 U.S. 1002 (1983) 22

Halperin v. Kissinger, 807 F.2d 180 (D.C. Cir. 1986) 24

Harlow v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 800 (1982) 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23

Haynesworth v. Miller, 820 F.2d 1245 (D.C. Cir. 1987) 25

Hays v. Jefferson County, 668 F.2d 869 (6th Cir. 1982), *cert. denied*, 459 U.S. 833 (1982) 25

Henriksen v. Bentley, 644 F.2d 852 (10th Cir. 1981) 25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES–Continued

Page

Hobson v. Wilson, 737 F.2d 1 (D.C. Cir. 1984), *cert. denied sub nom. Brennan v. Hobson*, 470 U.S. 1084 (1985) 12, 13, 14

Kennedy v. City of Cleveland, 797 F.2d 297 (6th Cir. 1986), *cert. denied sub nom. Hanton v. Kennedy*, 479 U.S. 1103 (1987) 22

Kenyatta v. Moore, 744 F.2d 1179 (5th Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 471 U.S. 1066 (1985) 24

Martin v. D.C. Metropolitan Police Dept., 812 F.2d 1425 (D.C. Cir. 1987) 13, 14, 19, 23

Mitchell v. Forsyth, 472 U.S. 511 (1985) 10, 18, 19, 21, 23

Personnel Administrator v. Feeney, 442 U.S. 256 (1979) 26

Poe v. Haydon, 853 F.2d 418 (6th Cir. 1988) 16

Procunier v. Navarette, 434 U.S. 555 (1978) 11

Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232 (1974) 11, 21

Watson v. Ft. Worth Bank and Trust, ___U.S.___, 108 S.Ct. 2777 (1988) 24

Wood v. Strickland, 420 U.S. 308 (1975) 11

Wright v. South Arkansas Regional Health Center, Inc., 800 F.2d 199 (8th Cir. 1986) 15, 19, 24

U.S. CONSTITUTION

Fourteenth Amendment, Equal Protection Clause 12, 14, 18, 24, 26

STATUTES

42 U.S.C. §1983 ..... *passim*

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §2000e *et seq.* 15

COUNTERSTATEMENT OF THE CASE

Toward late November or early December 1984, Petitioner, employed by the Commonwealth of Kentucky as a night shift janitor in the Capitol Building, asked Respondent, Building Superintendent, Don Haydon, for a day shift position in the Capitol. When Haydon explained that such a transfer was not possible, Petitioner commented that she didn't like being the only female employee on the night janitorial shift [R. 18, Haydon Depo. 11]. Haydon had never known of any problems with sexual harassment in the building. He inquired generally of Petitioner as to whether anyone was giving her a problem. She responded in the negative [R. 18, Haydon Depo. 11]. The following day, however, Petitioner changed her story and hinted to Haydon that someone was "bothering" her. At that time, Petitioner affirmatively refused to identify anyone, indicating she did not want to get someone in trouble [R. 10, Poe Depo. 22; R. 18, Haydon Depo. 11-13]. Petitioner rejected Haydon's offers to try to correct the situation [R. 10, Poe Depo. 20-21; R. 18, Haydon Depo. 12-13].

Within a few days of her conversation with Haydon, on December 10, 1984, Petitioner underwent a change of heart about publicizing the accusations. She presented a letter to Haydon's supervisor, Respondent, Robert Smither, Branch Manager, Building Services, accusing her foreman, J.L. Henderson, of sexual harassment [R. 10, Ex. 1 to Poe Depo.]. At the same time, she disseminated copies of the December 10 letter to some of the Respondents and to three other senior executives in State Government, whom she also named as Defendants. Subsequently, these persons were dismissed from this

case. The general allegations in the letter were that Henderson followed her around, watched her and, on one occasion, suggested that they have an affair. The most serious allegation was that Henderson "grabbed, held me down which caused a bruise on my right arm and he kissed me."[1]

Upon receipt of the December 10 letter, immediate action was taken by certain of Respondents. Before Petitioner started her next work shift, Respondent John Spicer, Director, Division of Physical Plant, conducted a meeting with Henderson, Haydon and Smither to determine the facts [R. 18, Haydon Depo. 21; R. 21, Spicer Depo. 5; R. 12, Smither Depo. 16-17]. Henderson denied all of the allegations categorically. Nevertheless, these managers advised him that if any form of sexual harassment was occurring, it would not be tolerated. [R. 18, Haydon Depo. 21, 82; R. 17, Ex. 3 to Hammond Depo.]. This admonishment took place on the day of first actual notice of Petitioner's charges against Henderson. By Petitioner's own admission, Henderson has not bothered her since.

On the same day, Smither and Haydon met with Petitioner and attempted to achieve some expedient resolution of the dispute between Petitioner and Henderson. After advising Petitioner that there were no openings on the day shift in the Capitol, Smither gave Petitioner the

---

[1] Petitioner now characterizes this alleged incident as an attempted rape, but in her Complaint she claimed she was subject to an assault, battery, and false imprisonment [R. 1, Complaint]. In any event, no state civil or state criminal charges have been pursued by the Petitioner.

option of a move across the street to the Capitol Annex[2] or the placement of two other janitors she trusted to work with her, thus eliminating any possibility of further harassment or dispute over what was in fact happening [R. 18, Haydon Depo. 30, 31; R. 10, Poe Depo. 29-30; R. 21, Spicer Depo. 18; R. 12, Smither Depo. 19-23, 32]. She chose the latter [R. 18, Haydon Depo. 31, 67-68; R. 21, Spicer Depo. 18; R. 12, Smither Depo. 23]. Division Director Spicer, who had suggested this arrangement, believed it would protect both parties during the pendency of any further investigation into the matter [R. 21, Spicer Depo. 18, 22]. Spicer was Smither's immediate supervisor who, in the line of supervision, was Haydon's superior.

Respondent, Paul A. ("Tony") Miller, Jr., Commissioner of the Department for Facilities and Management (Spicer's superior) had formally asked Spicer to look into the matter and, on December 13, Miller received a report from Spicer that a workable solution had been found [R. 13, Miller Depo. 5; R. 17, Ex. 3 to Hammond Depo.].

Respondent, Ventra Hammond, Executive Director of the Office of Equal Employment Opportunity and Contract Compliance in Finance and Administration, a staff adjunct of the Cabinet Secretary's office, initiated her own inquiry at the request of the Secretary. A copy of the December 10 letter had been routed to the Secretary, who was originally named as a Defendant [R. 17, Hammond

---

[2] Petitioner admits that there is no difference in pay in the two jobs, but believes "the people in the Capitol are a lot cleaner than the people in the Capitol Annex" [R. 10, Poe Depo. 37].

Depo. 4]. Hammond met twice with Poe and once with Henderson during the week of December 18, 1984. Henderson again denied the allegations [R. 17, Hammond Depo. 18].

Based on these interviews and a copy of Spicer's December 13, 1984, memo to Miller [R. 17, Ex. 3 to Hammond Depo.], Hammond advised the Secretary of the Cabinet of what she had learned and her determination that the dispute, at base, was one person's word against another's [R. 17, Hammond Depo. 24, Ex. 6 to Hammond Depo.].

Hammond asked Spicer to investigate further by contacting the persons whom Petitioner said were witnesses. Spicer delegated this responsibility to Haydon who obtained statements from two fellow janitors, and a security guard on the night shift in the Capitol, all of whom were persons Petitioner had named as witnesses [R. 21, Spicer Depo. 28; R. 12, Smither Depo. 28-29; R. 18, Haydon Depo. 25-29; R. 17, Hammond Depo. 26-28, Ex. 5 to Hammond Depo.]. Spicer then transmitted the statements to Hammond [R. 17, Hammond Depo. 30]. These statements were not specifically supportive of Petitioner's charges. None of the individuals had witnessed the purported sexual assault cited in Petitioner's letter of December 10 or any other incident that could unmistakenly be deemed sexual harassment[3] [R. 18, Haydon

---

[3] The security guard who saw Henderson starting to enter a restroom in which Petitioner was working had no knowledge that Henderson was aware that Petitioner was in the restroom [R. 25, Tracy Depo. 46-50]. Petitioner did not even mention this

(Continued on following page)

Depo. 80-81]. Obviously, there was a significant credibility conflict, but no judgment was made about who was telling the truth. Since the investigation proved inconclusive, no action was taken against Henderson [R. 10, Ex. 3 to Poe Depo.].

Petitioner positively acknowledges that there was not a recurrence of harassment after she reported her allegations in the December 10 letter [R. 1, Poe Depo. 72]. Moreover, she made no further complaints and did not at the time claim or indicate, orally or in writing, that she was unhappy or upset with the new work crew arrangement. However, without any advance notice to her supervisor of her intention to do so, on December 20, 1984, she took a leave of absence [R. 10, Ex. 2 to Poe Depo.; R. 12, Smither Depo. 29-30].

Respondent, James Stewart, Executive Director of Office of Management Services in Finance and Administration, was not aware of any allegations until February, 1985, when Spicer contacted him for advice concerning the fact that Petitioner's leave of absence had expired [R. 14, Stewart Depo. 5].

Stewart's review of the investigation convinced him that it was not appropriate to dismiss Petitioner for job abandonment [R. 14, Stewart Depo. 10-11]. Therefore, he wrote Petitioner a letter on February 20, 1985, which gave

---

(Continued from previous page)

alleged incident in her December 10 letter and it was not mentioned in the witness contacts directed by Hammond. Respondents learned about this allegation only after they received Petitioner's March 28, 1985 EEOC charge.

her several options and reiterated the offer of a transfer to the day shift in the Capitol Annex [R. 10, Ex. 3 to Poe Depo.; R. 14, Stewart Depo. 10]. Petitioner responded on February 25 that she wanted her old job back in the Capitol [R. 10, Ex. 4 to Poe Depo.].

On March 1, 1985, Petitioner returned to work accompanied by an attorney. Since a day shift position in the Capitol was not available, the Capitol Annex position again was offered to Petitioner; she again rejected it [R. 10, Poe Depo. 43]. Because Petitioner and her attorney were adamant about her preference, Stewart made the decision to return Petitioner to her old job in the Capitol on the night shift[4] [R. 18, Haydon Depo. 79; R. 14, Stewart Depo. 14].

Subsequently, on March 28, 1985, Petitioner filed her first charge with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The charge clearly alleged that sexual harassment was continuing [R. 10, Ex. 5 to Poe Depo.].

Based on Petitioner's charge, Haydon and others mistakenly believed that Petitioner was still having problems with Henderson [R. 10, Poe Depo. 71; R. 18, Haydon Depo. 46, 80]. Therefore, Haydon strongly urged, and eventually Smither decided, that Petitioner should be reassigned to the Capitol Annex on the night shift at no loss in pay or benefits [R. 12, Smither Depo. 47; R. 17, Ex. 7 to Hammond Depo.].

---

[4] Petitioner worked alone when she returned. Thus the experiment with the three-person crew to which she objects lasted for only 8 work days in December, 1984.

On May 13, 1985, Miller again became involved when Petitioner came to his office complaining of the harassment by Henderson in November and December, 1984. She brought with her statements that she alleged were EEOC Affidavits [R. 10, Poe Depo. 48; R. 13, Miller Depo. 3, 4; R. 24, Ex. 1 to Clark Depo.]. Miller again took action immediately to have Respondent, Lowell Clark, who had succeeded Stewart in the position of Executive Director, Office of Management Services, look into the matter and check out Petitioner's witnesses [R. 13, Miller Depo. 4, 8, 9]. This was the first time Clark had heard of the case. Clark immediately met with and individually interviewed Petitioner and three of her witnesses [R. 24, Clark Depo. 8-9, 13, Ex. 2 to Clark Depo.].

Clark concluded that there still was no direct or convincing circumstantial proof of the allegations. Even one of Petitioner's principal witnesses indicated to Clark that he assumed the contacts he observed between Henderson and Petitioner were in a joking spirit [R. 24, Clark Depo. 18].

Clark found no reason to question the earlier investigation conducted by Hammond [R. 24, Clark Depo. 31-34]. Nevertheless, when Clark learned that Petitioner had written a letter on May 10 to the Attorney General of Kentucky, in which she again implied that the harassment was continuing [R. 13, Ex. 2 and Ex. 3 to Miller Depo.], he consulted with counsel for the Cabinet. Based on the earlier interviews and on the fact that Petitioner already had been moved to the adjoining Capitol Annex, where she could no longer have contact with Henderson, Clark determined that no change in Petitioner's assignment

should be made pending the EEOC investigation [R. 24, Clark Depo. 19].

Petitioner was transferred to and worked in the Capitol Annex on the night shift from May 13, 1985 until May 21, 1985, when she took another leave without pay. This leave lasted until June 7, 1985. During the leave of absence, Petitioner wrote a letter to Clark requesting a day shift assignment in the Capitol Annex when she returned to work [R. 10, Poe Depo. 46-47]. Since there were positions open there, management immediately granted Petitioner's request and she began this job on June 10, 1985.

On May 31, 1985, however, Petitioner filed a charge of retaliation with the EEOC alleging that her transfer to the night shift in the Capitol Annex on May 13 was in retaliation for the previous sex discrimination charge she had filed with the EEOC [R. 49, Motion to Reconsider, Attachment 2]. Petitioner subsequently abandoned both charges under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to pursue claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. However, no dispute now remains that since December 10, 1984, there have been no further incidents of alleged sexual harassment of Petitioner [R. 10, Poe Depo. 72].

On December 3, 1985, Petitioner commenced this action against Respondents as well as Henderson and several other employees of State Government.[5] Petitioner

---

[5] Henderson subsequently resigned his position with the State and was not a party to the appeal. Petitioner voluntarily dismissed other Defendants after discovery.

claimed generally that Respondents denied her equal protection and due process of law contrary to the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and sought $1,500,000 in damages against each Respondent under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The thrust of Petitioner's theory was that the form and manner in which Respondents responded to her allegations of sexual harassment were constitutionally deficient.

At the conclusion of discovery, during which all the Defendants were deposed by Petitioner's counsel, Defendants moved for summary judgment on the merits and on the basis of qualified immunity. The District Court denied the Motion for Summary Judgment [R. 48, Order]. The District Court also denied Defendants' Motion to Reconsider, ruling that Defendants "may have violated the plaintiff's clearly established rights and hence are not qualifiedly immune" [R. 71, Order p.1].

Respondents filed an interlocutory appeal on the issue of qualified immunity in the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. The Court of Appeals vacated the denial of summary judgment and remanded for further proceedings, holding that the District Court did not properly address the issue of qualified immunity. *Poe v. Haydon*, 853 F.2d 418 (6th Cir. 1988).

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The decision of the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit is entirely consistent with applicable decisions of the Supreme Court. This Court has held that § 1983

defendants are entitled to summary judgment if discovery fails to uncover evidence sufficient to create a genuine issue as to whether the defendants committed unconstitutional acts. *Mitchell v. Forsyth,* 472 U.S. 511 (1985). The Court of Appeals held that on remand the District Court must determine whether there is a genuine issue as to whether Respondents' conduct violated clearly established constitutional rights of equal protection and due process. Since, in context, Respondents' actions were otherwise objectively reasonable, the Court of Appeals correctly concluded that the motivation for the actions is crucial in determining whether the actions were unconstitutional. Therefore, the Court of Appeals held that Petitioner must produce direct evidence of unconstitutional motive in order to show a genuine issue of material fact requiring trial. Consistent with *Mitchell, supra,* and other decisions of the Supreme Court and other Courts of Appeals, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals properly remanded the action for this determination.

ARGUMENT:

REASONS WHY WRIT SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED

I. FEDERAL COURTS OF APPEALS HAVE CONSISTENTLY HELD, IN CONFORMITY WITH DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT, THAT A § 1983 PLAINTIFF ALLEGING A CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION IMPLICATING UNCONSTITUTIONAL MOTIVE MUST PRODUCE EVIDENCE OF UNCONSTITUTIONAL MOTIVE IN ORDER TO DEFEAT A DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT BASED ON QUALIFIED IMMUNITY.

This Court has consistently held that state officials are entitled to some form of personal immunity from

damage awards in a § 1983 suit. *Wood v. Strickland*, 420 U.S. 308 (1975); *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232 (1974). Petitioner has cited no decision of the Supreme Court which suggests that the immunity defense is not available in all § 1983 actions.

Traditionally, qualified immunity was defeated only if an official "knew or reasonably should have known that the action he took within his sphere of official responsibility would violate the constitutional rights of the [plaintiff] affected, or if he took the action with the malicious intention to cause a deprivation of constitutional rights or other injury. . . ." *Wood, supra*, at 322. *See also Procunier v. Navarette*, 434 U.S. 555 (1978).

More recently, however, the Supreme Court has recognized that the subjective component of the *Wood* test, which related to permissible intentions, invariably created an issue of fact requiring resolution by the jury. As a result, the purpose of immunity, "that insubstantial claims should not proceed to trial" was defeated. *Harlow v. Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 800, 816 (1982). Therefore, the Supreme Court deleted from its standard the subjective component.

> [B]are allegations of malice should not suffice to subject government officials either to the cost of trial or to the burden of broad-reaching discovery. We therefore hold that government officials performing discretionary functions generally are shielded from liability for civil damages insofar as their conduct does not violate clearly established statutory or constitutional rights of which a reasonable person would have known.

Id. at 817-18. The immunity defense now turns primarily on the question of the objective reasonableness of an

official's conduct, as measured by reference to clearly established law. Petitioner has failed to identify any subsequent decision of the Supreme Court which holds that *Harlow's* adoption of the objective standard eliminates the immunity defense in a § 1983 action when a plaintiff's claim requires proof of unconstitutional motive, as in a claimed equal protection violation.

Since *Harlow*, the Circuits which have considered the immunity defense in the context of a § 1983 action involving an unconstitutional motive have consistently held that bare allegations of unconstitutional motive do not suffice to circumvent *Harlow* and to deprive defendants of the defense of qualified immunity.

> We recognize that in some instances, plaintiffs might allege facts demonstrating that defendants have acted lawfully, append a claim that they did so with an unconstitutional motive, and as a consequence usher defendants into discovery, and perhaps trial with no hope of success on the merits. The result would be precisely the burden *Harlow* sought to prevent. Accordingly, in cases involving a claim that defendants acted with an unconstitutional motive, we will require that nonconclusory allegations of evidence of such intent must be present in a complaint for litigants to proceed to discovery on the claim. The allegations on this issue may not be extensive, but they will have to be sufficiently precise to put defendants on notice of the nature of the claim and enable them to prepare a response and, where appropriate, a summary judgment motion on qualified immunity grounds.

Hobson v. Wilson, 737 F.2d 1, 29 (D.C. Cir. 1984), *cert. denied sub nom. Brennan v. Hobson*, 470 U.S. 1084 (1985).

As *Hobson, supra,* recognized, this rule is consistent with the general rule of all Circuits requiring particularity in pleading for civil rights complaints.

> We simply remind our trial courts that some factual allegations must support claims of unconstitutional motives. Plaintiffs who fail to allege any specific facts to support the claim of unconstitutional motive cannot expect to involve Government actors in protracted discovery and trial. On receipt of such a complaint, Government defendants might move for dismissal or, alternatively, for summary judgment. Then plaintiffs must produce some factual support for their claim to avert dismissal.

Hobson, supra, at 30.

In *Martin v. D.C. Metropolitan Police Dept.*, 812 F.2d 1425 (D.C. Cir. 1987), the District of Columbia Circuit further elaborated upon the principles it set forth in *Hobson*. In *Martin*, the plaintiff, who had been convicted of unlawful entry, alleged that defendants were animated by the improper motive of covering up their beating of him when they decided to pursue his arrest and indictment. The court first pointed out that absent unconstitutional motive for the plaintiff's arrest and prosecution, the defendants' conduct was within the general ambit of law enforcement duties, was objectively reasonable and was not violative of any clearly established law. The court therefore concluded that a restrictive interpretation of *Harlow*, which foreclosed any inquiry into an official's subjective motivation, would unfairly deprive a plaintiff of a remedy in all cases in which the official's state of mind is an essential component of the alleged constitutional violation. As in *Hobson*, however,

the court emphasized that unsupported claims of unconstitutional motive are not enough.

> Where the defendant's subjective intent is an essential component of plaintiff's claim, once defendant has moved for pretrial judgment based on a showing of the objective reasonableness of his actions, then plaintiff, to avert dismissal short of trial, must come forward with something more than inferential or circumstantial support for his allegations of unconstitutional motive. That is, some direct evidence that the officials' actions were improperly motivated must be produced if the case is to proceed to trial.

Id. at 1435. Thus, the District of Columbia Circuit has clearly held that a plaintiff is not entitled to go to trial simply because his claim implicates the defendant's subjective state of mind.

Gutierrez v. Municipal Court of S.E. Judicial District, 838 F.2d 1031 (9th Cir. 1988), cited by Petitioner, is not to the contrary. Petitioner's selective quotation misrepresents the actual holding in *Gutierrez*, where the Ninth Circuit cited extensively from *Hobson* and *Martin*.

> We hold, along with the District of Columbia Circuit, that where the lawfulness of a challenged act is dependent upon the actor's motive or intent, the purpose for which the act was undertaken must be analyzed and not just the act itself. We also hold that in deciding whether a defendant is entitled to qualified immunity in cases in which unlawful motive is a critical element, the court must consider the actor's intent in carrying out the act that is alleged to have resulted in the violation of the plaintiff's rights.

Gutierrez, supra, at 1051. Rather than denying the defense of qualified immunity in equal protection actions, the court simply emphasized that it is the plaintiff's burden

to establish intentional discrimination, and only if he does so is the defense not available.

Because the plaintiff in *Gutierrez* also had Title VII claims, he was entitled to discovery. The court indicated, however, that it approved the District of Columbia Circuit's position that a § 1983 plaintiff also might be entitled to limited discovery when a defendant makes a motion for summary judgment based on qualified immunity.

Petitioner also misconstrued the rule in the Eighth Circuit, when she cited *Goodwin v. Circuit Court of St. Louis County, Missouri*, 729 F.2d 541 (8th Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 1216 (1985), for the proposition that qualified immunity is not a defense in cases involving intentional discrimination. In *Goodwin*, the defendant asserted qualified immunity as a defense to damages only *after* a jury found that the defendant had intentionally discriminated on the basis of sex. In such a situation it is obvious why the defense is precluded. That situation does not exist here.

In a more recent § 1983 case involving unconstitutional motive, the Eighth Circuit reversed a denial of summary judgment on the issue of qualified immunity. In *Wright v. South Arkansas Regional Health Center, Inc.*, 800 F.2d 199 (8th Cir. 1986), the plaintiff alleged that the defendant retaliated against him for exercise of his First Amendment rights by initiating an investigation that led to plaintiff's losing his job. The court recognized that the right to be free of official retaliation for the exercise of

First Amendment rights was clearly established. However, the defendant's motivation was crucial to the existence of the constitutional claim. Without an impermissible motive to retaliate, the defendant did nothing more than perform his duty of reporting suspected violations of the law. The court concluded that, in response to defendant's motion for summary judgment, the plaintiff had produced no evidence that defendant's motivation was unconstitutional and therefore, there was no genuine issue, triable to a jury, of improper motivation.

The Court of Appeals Opinion in the present case is entirely consistent with the decisions of other Circuits on this question. The Court cited those decisions and agreed with them that "a government official's motive or intent in carrying out challenged conduct must be considered in the qualified immunity analysis, where unlawful motive or intent is a critical element of the substantive claim." *Poe v. Haydon*, 853 F.2d 418, 431 (6th Cir. 1988).

Respondents' decisions to assign the Petitioner to work with two other janitors and to transfer her to the Capitol Annex were objectively reasonable, and, "[w]ithout an intent to discriminate on the basis of sex . . . reflected at most an attempt at a temporary resolution of an ambiguous situation" *Poe, supra*, at 432. In view of this fact, the Sixth Circuit properly ruled that Petitioner must present direct evidence that the Respondents' actions were motivated by her gender in order to defeat their motion for summary judgment. The Court of Appeals further determined that the issue of Respondents' motivation had not been properly addressed by the District Court or adequately briefed by the parties in

the appeal. Therefore, the Court of Appeals remanded this case to give Petitioner an opportunity to amend her response to Respondents' motion for summary judgment in order to make the necessary showing of improper motive.

The decision of the Court of Appeals that the Petitioner must provide direct evidence of gender-based animus in order to withstand a motion for summary judgment based on qualified immunity is consistent with this Court's view that "qualified immunity questions should be resolved at the earliest possible stage of litigation." *Anderson v. Creighton*, ___ U.S. ___, 107 S.Ct. 3034, 3042 n.6 (1987). The Court of Appeals has given the Petitioner another opportunity to justify her claims. If she cannot do so, Respondents should not be subjected to the burdens of trial that *Harlow* sought to prevent. In view of the additional opportunities that Petitioner will have to refute Respondents' motion for summary judgment in the District Court, this case does not present the proper factual or procedural framework for this Court to consider this question of federal law.

II. FEDERAL COURTS OF APPEALS HAVE UNIFORMLY HELD, CONSISTENT WITH DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT, THAT A § 1983 PLAINTIFF HAS THE BURDEN OF PRODUCING EVIDENCE SUFFICIENT TO CREATE A GENUINE ISSUE AS TO WHETHER THE DEFENDANT ACTED UNCONSTITUTIONALLY WHEN THE DEFENDANT MOVES FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT BASED ON QUALIFIED IMMUNITY.

The Sixth Circuit recognized that under *Harlow, supra*, qualified immunity is an affirmative defense which

must be pleaded by the official. Respondents indisputably did plead qualified immunity as a defense.

Citing its earlier decision in *Dominique v. Telb*, 831 F.2d 673 (6th Cir. 1987), the Court of Appeals ruled that a plaintiff should normally include in his original complaint all of the factual allegations necessary to sustain a conclusion that the defendant violated clearly established law. This ruling is entirely consistent with *Mitchell, supra*, at 526, where the Supreme Court held that "unless the plaintiff's allegations state a claim of violation of clearly established law, a defendant pleading qualified immunity is entitled to dismissal before the commencement of discovery." Implicit in these cases is the principle that a plaintiff has the burden at the pleading stage of setting forth the clearly established law and asserting facts, which if true, show a violation of that law.

The Court below determined that at the time of the acts of which Petitioner complains, the law was clearly established that employment decisions based on gender violate the equal protection clause of the Constitution. Therefore, the only remaining issue in determining whether Respondents violated Petitioner's constitutional rights is whether Respondents' employment decisions were motivated by discriminatory gender-based animus. Respondents do not claim that they "neither knew nor should have known of the relevant legal standard," *Harlow, supra*, at 819, *i.e.*, that employment actions motivated by sexually discriminatory animus violate the equal protection clause.

Since full discovery had already occurred, the Court of Appeals ruled that Petitioner must present direct evidence that the officials' actions were improperly motivated in order to defeat Respondents' motion for summary judgment. This ruling is consistent with the burden placed on the plaintiff in *Mitchell, supra,* where the Supreme Court held that "the defendant is entitled to summary judgment if discovery fails to uncover evidence sufficient to create a genuine issue as to whether the defendant in fact committed those acts." *Mitchell, supra,* at 526. It is also consistent with the opinions in other Circuits which have addressed the immunity defense in the context of a § 1983 action involving unconstitutional motive. *See Gutierrez, supra; Martin, supra; Wright, supra.*

In accordance with standard principles for deciding a motion for summary judgment, the Court of Appeals directed the District Court to consider all the undisputed evidence produced as a result of discovery, read in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. In light of these directions which are so favorable to Petitioner, it is unnecessary to resolve the question of burdens of proof.

The Court of Appeals Opinion correctly set forth the respective burdens of the parties. The Opinion does not conflict with any decision of this Court or other Circuits on this issue. This case does not present any important unresolved questions which the Supreme Court need address again.

III. WHETHER § 1983 DEFENDANTS ARE REQUIRED TO PLEAD QUALIFIED IMMUNITY WITH SPECIFICITY WHEN THEIR PLEADING HAS PUT THE PLAINTIFF ON NOTICE OF THE DEFENSE IS NOT AN IMPORTANT QUESTION OF FEDERAL LAW WHICH SHOULD BE SETTLED BY THE SUPREME COURT.

Respondents' Amended Answer pleaded that some of the Defendants were immune from personal liability. The liberal rules of notice pleading require nothing more. Petitioner has cited absolutely no authority in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or the case law for her contention that the defense of qualified immunity is waived if not pleaded for each particular defendant. The basic defense is the same for all.

Gomez v. Toledo, 446 U.S. 635 (1980) and *Alexander v. Alexander*, 706 F.2d 751 (6th Cir. 1983), cited by the Petitioner, held only that a defendant has the burden of pleading qualified immunity. Respondents have met that burden. Petitioner has identified no authority which requires more specificity at the pleading stage.

In her briefs to the Court of Appeals, Petitioner asserted that all of the Respondents possessed responsibility and policy-making authority with respect to claims of sexual harassment [Appellee's Brief to Court of Appeals, p. 12]. By acknowledging Respondents' discretionary authority, Petitioner thereby provided the basis upon which Respondents are entitled to personal immunity. "[G]overnment officials performing discretionary functions *generally* are shielded from liability for civil damages . . . ." *Harlow, supra*, at 818 [emphasis added].

The Court of Appeals correctly ruled that Respondents' Amended Answer provided Petitioner and the District Court with sufficient notice of Respondents' claim to qualified immunity. Moreover, Petitioner certainly was on actual notice of Respondents' qualified immunity defense after receiving a motion for summary judgment detailing Respondents' position on the issue. The Court of Appeals Opinion is not in conflict with any decision of the Supreme Court or another federal Court of Appeals, and the pleading requirement is not an important question which should be addressed by the Supreme Court.

IV. THE SUPREME COURT HAS CONSISTENTLY PERMITTED § 1983 DEFENDANTS TO MOVE FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT BASED ON QUALIFIED IMMUNITY AFTER DISCOVERY HAS OCCURRED.

The law is well established that defendant officials are entitled to raise the immunity defense in a motion for summary judgment. Indeed, several of the most frequently cited cases on immunity came before the lower courts on motions for summary judgment. *See, e.g., Mitchell, supra; Harlow, supra; Scheuer, supra.*

The Sixth Circuit has explicitly recognized the right to move for summary judgment based on personal immunity:

> First, if the pleading itself is insufficient the defendant may file a motion to dismiss and upon denial thereof take an immediate appeal. . . . If the complaint sufficiently alleges actions outside the scope of the official's immunity, the defendant still retains the right to file a motion for summary judgment so that

> the further harassment of going to trial may be avoided. If, however, summary judgment predicated on a claim of immunity is denied it is once more possible to appeal from an adverse ruling on the Rule 56 motion and to obtain a stay of trial pending a resolution of that issue on appeal.

Kennedy v. City of Cleveland, 797 F.2d 297, 299-300 (6th Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 479 U.S. 1103 (1987). *See also Hall v. United States*, 704 F.2d 246 (6th Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 464 U.S. 1002 (1983). Moreover, in *Kennedy, supra*, the court recognized that defendants are entitled to assert the defense of qualified immunity even during a trial. Thus, the waiver of qualified immunity contemplated in *Kennedy* is a waiver in stages. For instance, a defendant who fails to file a timely motion to dismiss may waive the right to be immune from discovery. However, he clearly does not waive the right to be immune from trial.

The purpose of the immunity defense is to protect defendants from the burdens of litigation. If defendants voluntarily submit to the burdens of discovery, the plaintiff has no basis to complain. Far from being prejudiced, the plaintiff in fact has the opportunity to obtain additional evidence to support her claim. If she cannot do so after discovery, there is all the more reason for granting a defendant immunity and avoidance of trial.

Petitioner has identified no authority which supports her contention that an amended answer and motion for summary judgment on the basis of qualified immunity after discovery represent an inexcusable delay waiving the defense. The Court of Appeals Opinion is consistent with Supreme Court decisions and does not conflict with another Court of Appeals decision.

V. FEDERAL COURTS OF APPEALS HAVE UNIFORMLY HELD THAT A § 1983 PLAINTIFF MUST PRESENT DIRECT EVIDENCE OF UNCONSTITUTIONAL MOTIVE WHEN UNCONSTITUTIONAL MOTIVE IS AN ELEMENT OF THE PLAINTIFF'S CLAIM IN ORDER TO DEFEAT A MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT BASED ON QUALIFIED IMMUNITY AND THESE DECISIONS ARE CONSISTENT WITH SUPREME COURT DECISIONS.

In *Mitchell v. Forsyth,* this Court emphasized that *Harlow* "refashioned the qualified immunity doctrine in such a way as to 'permit the resolution of many insubstantial claims on summary judgment.' " *Mitchell, supra,* at 526 (quoting *Harlow, supra,* at 817-18). The Court has consistently condemned insubstantial suits against public officers and required resolution at the earliest possible stage. *See Anderson,supra,* at 3039 n.2.

It was because of this Court's clear admonitions against insubstantial § 1983 claims proceeding to trial that the District of Columbia Circuit in *Martin, supra,* concluded that a summary judgment standard more demanding of plaintiffs is required when public officer defendants move for summary judgment on the basis of their qualified immunity. *See Martin, supra,* at 1435. As a result, in *Martin,* the court ruled that to avert dismissal a plaintiff must produce some direct evidence of unconstitutional motive when the defendant's subjective intent is an essential component of the plaintiff's claim.

The Court of Appeals panel in this case reached the same conclusion and required Petitioner to present direct evidence of Respondents' improper discriminatory

motive on her equal protection claim. Petitioner has presented no valid reason nor identified any case authority which supports her contention that the requirement for demonstrating unconstitutional motive should differ depending upon the constitutional violation at issue. Many courts have indicated that the role of impermissible motive in a qualified immunity defense is the same, whenever motive is an element of a plaintiff's claim. *See, e.g., Wright, supra* (comparing improper motive in civil rights and First Amendment actions); *Halperin v. Kissinger,* 807 F.2d 180 (D.C. Cir. 1986); *Kenyatta v. Moore,* 744 F.2d 1179 (5th Cir. 1984), *cert. denied,* 471 U.S. 1066 (1985).

Petitioner's reliance on *Watson v. Ft. Worth Bank and Trust,* ___ U.S. ___, 108 S.Ct. 2777 (1988), to support her contention that circumstantial evidence should suffice to prove discriminatory motive is misplaced. In *Watson* this Court concluded that a Title VII plaintiff could introduce statistical evidence to show that subjective employment selection procedures had a disparate impact on minorities or other groups protected by Title VII. The present action does not involve selection procedures. Furthermore, Petitioner has never sought to introduce any evidence whatsoever of statistical disparities between male and female employees of the Department of Finance and Administration.

Petitioner's contention that courts have long permitted circumstantial or inferential evidence to prove subjective discriminatory motive is unsupported by citation to any authority, much less a § 1983 decision involving an equal protection claim.

The Court of Appeals' ruling on the evidence required is consistent with Supreme Court decisions concerning the qualified immunity defense and does not merit review.

VI. FEDERAL COURTS OF APPEALS HAVE CONSISTENTLY HELD THAT SUPERVISORY OFFICIALS WHO DID NOT ACTIVELY PARTICIPATE IN OR AUTHORIZE CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS ARE NOT PERSONALLY LIABLE FOR ALLEGED CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS BY AN EMPLOYEE IN A § 1983 ACTION AND THESE DECISIONS ARE NOT IN CONFLICT WITH ANY DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT.

The Sixth Circuit panel rejected Petitioner's sexual harassment claim against Respondents because she did not allege that they actively participated in or authorized any harassment by Henderson. This decision is consistent with the Sixth Circuit's prior decisions in *Bellamy v. Bradley*, 729 F.2d 416 (6th Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 845 (1984) and *Hays v. Jefferson County*, 668 F.2d 869 (6th Cir. 1982), *cert. denied*, 459 U.S. 833 (1982).

The Sixth Circuit does not stand alone in holding that direct participation by a supervisory official is required to establish liability. Numerous courts have concluded that the doctrine of respondeat superior does not apply in § 1983 actions and that more than mere negligence on the part of a supervisor is necessary to state a claim against him. *See, e.g., Haynesworth v. Miller*, 820 F.2d 1245 (D.C. Cir. 1987); *Henriksen v. Bentley*, 644 F.2d 852 (10th Cir. 1981); *Duchesne v. Sugarman*, 566 F.2d 817 (2d Cir. 1977). The necessity of showing direct participation is

even more apparent when a claim is based on the equal protection clause for which purposeful discrimination must be shown. *Personnel Administrator v. Feeney*, 442 U.S. 256 (1979).

There is no evidence in the record that any of the Respondents were aware of any allegations of sexual harassment by Henderson until Petitioner's December 10 letter. Even assuming Respondents were aware of harassment, however, Petitioner has failed to cite a single case which imposes § 1983 liability on supervisors on this basis.

The Court of Appeals separately addressed the subsequent employment actions that Respondents took with respect to Petitioner and what evidence Petitioner must show to establish that those actions constituted an equal protection violation. Petitioner has confused that issue with the separate issue of sexual harassment. The Court of Appeals decision on liability for sexual harassment is consistent with previous decisions of the Sixth Circuit and other Courts of Appeals and is not in conflict with any decision of this Court. This is not an issue which needs to be settled by the Supreme Court.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, Respondents respectfully submit that there are no special or important reasons for granting a Writ of Certiorari in this case, and respectfully urge this Court to deny the present Petition.

EDWIN S. HOPSON
Counsel of Record for Respondents
RHONDA E. CURRY
WYATT, TARRANT & COMBS
Citizens Plaza
Louisville, Kentucky 40202
(502) 589-5235

OF COUNSEL:

MONTE D. GROSS
Office of Legal and Legislative Services
Finance and Administration Cabinet
Commonwealth of Kentucky
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601